

SCIENCE AND POLITICS

THE NEW SOCIOLOGY IN THE SOVIET UNION

by GEORGE FISCHER



CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Professor Fischer lived and studied in the Soviet Union for a decade prior to World War II. He returned during the war for a year, and has made several visits since.

SCIENCE AND POLITICS

THE NEW SOCIOLOGY IN THE SOVIET UNION

by GEORGE FISCHER

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Ithaca, New York, 1964

Copyright 1964, by Cornell University

Library of Congress Catalogue Card Number: 64-15198

Printed in the United States of America

For P. W. M.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Cornell University, and to Cornell's Social Science Research Center and Center for International Studies, for making possible visits to the Soviet Union in January 1962 and again in January 1963. For hospitality during these visits, I should like to express my appreciation to the Philosophy Institute of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, Moscow University and Leningrad University, and also the Institute of Soviet-American Relations.

CONTENTS

I. Science and Politics	1
II. Philosophers, Social Scientists, Sociologists	14
III. Scholars and Institutions	20
IV. A Sociology of Work	32
V. Research: Technology and Training	39
VI. Research: Attitudes at Work	45
VII. Theory: Class Structure	58
Index	68

CHAPTER I

Science and Politics

Soviet scholarship, or Science in the broad sense, is today extending professional recognition and granting autonomy to a field of learning that until recently hardly existed in the U.S.S.R. The field is sociology. Its status as a full-fledged member of the scholarly community, however, is still far from complete. As yet, too, it has not carried out its many stated aspirations and plans. The next few years will tell us more than can be known now about progress in both of these areas. What is already clear, however, is that we are witnessing some significant new beginnings in the field of sociology in the U.S.S.R.

Some of the earliest first-hand observations on these new beginnings were made in May 1961. At that time, Robert K. Merton (Columbia University) and Henry W. Riecken (National Science Foundation) took part in an official exchange visit of ten prominent American social scientists. This is how Merton and Riecken concluded their report:

The degree of detail in analyzing sociological problems appears to be hedged in by official doctrine, value-orientations, and received convictions to a degree which seems scarcely recognized by the research workers themselves. To some extent, this affects their orientation to methods of analyzing empirical data. Multivariate analysis becomes simply irrelevant when practical empiricism calls only for identifying broad aggregates of people who behave in distinctive ways, and when sociological research is conceived as primarily the handmaiden of programmed social action. Yet, once again, and without essaying the dubious role of prophets, we are inclined to believe that as empirical research develops in Soviet sociology, there will occur a growing convergence between at least the methods developed in the U.S.S.R. and in the United States. (1)

In the two or three years since the Merton Report, no radical change took place. Very little if anything in this report requires major modification. At the same time, here and there these years did produce crystallization of the field.

(1) Robert K. Merton and Henry W. Riecken, "Notes on Sociology in the U.S.S.R.," in National Institute of Social and Behavioral Science, Symposia Studies Series no. 10, **Current Problems in Social-Behavioral Research** (Washington, D. C.), March 1962, p. 7. This report is hereafter cited as **Merton Report**.

Three such areas of crystallization stand out. First, there has been some clarification in the Soviet image of sociology—both the scholarly image and the official image. Secondly, there has been a growth in the number of scholars and institutions more actively involved in the new sociology. Finally, there is now more published research and theory available to suggest and to answer a key question: Why, and in what ways, is sociology in the Soviet Union predominantly a sociology of work?

In Soviet programmatic statements on the new sociology, one particular theme recurs. This is the determination to be scientific—"scientific" not only in the special Soviet sense of Marxism-Leninism as a scientific doctrine of society, but also in the usual sense of rigorous and verifiable method of seeking knowledge.

In 1962, a major paper on the subject was presented to the Fifth World Congress of Sociology, meeting in Washington, D.C. The statement came from two prominent social scientists, G. V. Osipov and M. T. Yovchuk:

Concrete social studies provide the foundation for scientific sociology. They are the substance for scientific generalization

The scientific determination of the methods and the techniques of research is an important part of social study in Soviet society. (2)

A month after the publication of the Osipov Paper, the leading scholars of the country — the senior members of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences — lent their names to another statement which emphasized the same theme. This statement describes the views and decisions on Soviet social sciences adopted at an annual general meeting of the Academy in October 1962. Echoing recurrent official condemnations of petty, impractical, or overly theoretical scholarship, the academicians' statement stressed:

The general meeting of the USSR Academy of Sciences considers that an absolute requirement for the success of scientific work in the social sciences on actual problems is concrete social investigation

It is essential to provide wide application to the humanities of precise scientific methods, especially mathematics, cyber-

(2) G. Osipov and M. Yovchuk, "Some Principles of Theory, Problems, and Methods of Research in Sociology in the U.S.S.R.," *American Sociological Review*, vol. 28, no. 4, August 1963, p. 621, 622. This paper is hereafter cited as **Osipov Paper**.

netics, statistics and the like, to broaden field studies, to practice widely scientific experiments

Acting along these lines, the Academy general meeting decided: "to widen field work significantly, to assure more extensive development of statistical materials and their skillful use, and to apply mathematical and other advanced scientific methods more widely." (3)

Official support for such a policy came at the same general meeting of the Academy. It was voiced in a major policy speech by L. F. Ilichev, CPSU Presidium member and a Secretary of the Central Committee who heads the Party's Ideological Commission. In his speech, which preceded the academicians' just-quoted statement, Ilichev insisted that Soviet science as a whole must now pay far greater attention and deference to the social sciences. The high Party official pictured the growing output and stature of Soviet social sciences — including sociology — as part of the over-all changes of the past few years, and the overcoming of the Cult of Personality. In calling for even greater development of the social sciences in the U.S.S.R., Ilichev made clear the main reasons for such development, and the proper relationship between science as scholarship, science as doctrine, and politics:

The Marxist-Leninist science of society forms the scientific basis of the Party's domestic as well as its foreign policy Now that our homeland has entered the period of full-scale building of communism, many new theoretical questions are coming up before the party

This causes a constantly increasing volume of theoretical activity by our Party and its headquarters, the Party Central Committee The specialists and institutions in the social sciences are the Party's active helpers in working out scientific principles for directing the development of Soviet society. (4)

(3) "Zadachi Razvitiia Obschestvennykh Nauk v Usloviakh Razvernutoho Stroitelstva Kommunizma, Postanovlenie Obshchego Sobraniia Akademii Nauk SSSR" (The Tasks of Developing the Social Sciences in the Course of Actively Building Communism, A Resolution of the General Meeting of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences), *Vestnik Akademii Nauk S.S.S.R.*, vol. XXXII, no. 12, December 1962, pp. 61-62.

(4) L. F. Ilichev, "Nauchnaia Osnova Rukovodstva Razvitiem Obschestva, Nekotorye Problemy Razvitiia Obschestvennykh Nauk" (The Scientific Basis of Guiding the Development of Society, Some Problems in the Development of the Social Sciences), *Vestnik Akademii Nauk S.S.S.R.*, vol. XXXI, no. 11, November 1962, p. 11. A *Pravda* summary of the Ilichev speech is translated in *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, vol. XIV, no. 42, November 14, 1962.

How leading social scientists themselves speak of this intimate link of science and politics is illustrated by the Osipov Paper. Referring to "a good many concrete sociological experiments" of recent years, the paper goes so far as to include among them the new program of the Communist Party, adopted in 1961. As the Osipov Paper puts it:

The new program of the CPSU is an example of concrete research conducted by sociologists. The program is based on profound and varied economic, sociological, statistical and other social research conducted by party, governmental and scientific organizations and it directs major social changes for the next twenty years.

Osipov and his co-author, Yovchuk, also spell out the central, underlying purpose of the newer scientific studies. "These studies help us to find ways of influencing social events through public opinion and support." (5)

After dwelling similarly on the internal, domestic tasks of Soviet social scientists, the academicians' statement of October 1962 turns to a second major domain:

The international obligation of Soviet scholars is to intensify the criticism of bourgeois ideology and first of all the reactionary conceptions of anti-communism. Criticism of bourgeois and reformist ideology must debunk not only the conclusions but also the arguments of anti-communist ideologists fearlessly and on scientific grounds. For this purpose it is essential to study the contemporary economy, politics, culture, and ideology of foreign countries deeply and comprehensively. The direct duty of scholars is to inform the world's public widely about the successes of the Soviet Union in all spheres of life, including the realm of the humanities. (6)

To attack "bourgeois" ideas and foreign criticisms of communism, to acquire significant additional knowledge of the outside world in order to do this all the better, and to continue ceaselessly broadcasting Soviet achievements abroad — these are the clearly formulated international tasks of Soviet social scientists.

(5) Osipov Paper, p. 622.

(6) "Zadachi Razvitiia Obshchestvennykh Nauk v Usloviakh Razvernutoho Stroitelstva Kommunizma, Postanovlenie Obshchego Sobraniia Akademii Nauk SSSR" (The Tasks of Developing the Social Sciences in the Course of Actively Building Communism, A Resolution of the General Meeting of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences), *Vestnik Akademii Nauk S.S.S.R.*, vol. XXXII, no. 12, December 1962, pp. 61-62.

If the new sociology is avowedly and unmistakably part and parcel of politics, in the sense of official activities and policy-making, can we speak at all of science — of a new field of scholarship emerging in the U.S.S.R.? The answer appears to be that both the officials and the scholars involved are now committed to the belief that public policy and the state in general — notably the Party and its leaders — can and will gain from encouraging extensive scholarly work and advanced research methods. The framework and goals are to be those of politics, but the methods of fact-gathering, and analysis of the facts, are to conform to the canons of science.

Such an intimate and all-encompassing bond between a dominant state and an emerging field is unique in the annals of modern science. Scholars abroad are bound to wonder whether this intimate bond can produce any scientific harvest whatsoever. No conclusive answer is possible for at least several years. Meanwhile, official statements have offered two different arguments as to why the arrangement is not necessarily detrimental to the new Soviet sociology.

In his major speech to the Academy, Ilichev emphasized the advantages of "the monolithic nature" of Soviet social science:

Some of our opponents in the West try to present as a short-coming what is an enormous merit of Marxist-Leninist science — its unity and monolithic nature

It seems not to occur to the bourgeois critics that the merits of sociology, and for that matter of any other science, lie not at all in diversity of points of view. Depth and correctness in reflecting objective reality, foresight as to the ways and laws of its development and richness in practical results — these are the integral qualities of true science

The single and unified Marxist-Leninist world view is a source of strength for our sociology. (7)

On a more technical level, the Osipov Paper to the Fifth World Congress of Sociology raises another point that lies at the heart of this singular Soviet link between social science and public policy. According to Osipov and Yovchuk, a social science of the Soviet type can and does

(7) L. F. Ilichev, "Nauchnaia Osnova Rukovodstva Razvitiem Obshchestva, Nekotorye Problemy Razvitiia Obshchestvennykh Nauk" (The Scientific Basis of Guiding the Development of Society, Some Problems in the Development of the Social Sciences), *Vestnik Akademii Nauk S.S.S.R.*, vol. XXXII, no. 11, November 1962, p. 30.

permit the use of all-encompassing research methods. The contrast here is to Western or "bourgeois" sociology. In Soviet eyes, sociology in the West is retarded or even crippled by accepting research findings based on only one or two of a great number of possible research methods.

Aided and abetted both by a doctrine or science of society (Marxism-Leninism) and by guidance from the state, Soviet sociology, in the view of its spokesmen, benefits greatly by the wide scope of its research methods. These methods, in turn, derive from the field's theoretical and organizational foundations:

Sociology in the Soviet Union combines the scientific methods of sociological research, [while] in Western sociology they are usually divided into objective and subjective. Sociological research in the U.S.S.R. includes analysis of statistical reports and official papers, analysis of forms and methods of the activity of workers' organizations, discussions with workers about their sociological problems, social environment, outward and inside observations, written and oral polls, study of personal documents, etc. (8)

Not long ago, a methodological essay by two Leningrad sociologists carried further this distinction between Soviet and Western sociology.

Bourgeois positivist sociologists usually contrast "theoretical" or "pure" with "applied" sociology. This is a peculiar method of "compensating" for the sterility and complete impotence in the area of general theory by the amount of practical results of empirical research, which is on the whole commissioned directly by capitalist monopolies and government agencies. All of this research is in general aimed at weakening social conflict within the framework of capitalism and finding effective means of "social control" in the interests of the ruling top group. As far as general sociological theory is concerned, it, as R. Merton notes, now stands on the level of medicine in the sixteenth century, and therefore serious demands cannot be made of it.

The situation in Marxist sociology is completely different. Marxist sociological research, no matter how "theoretical" it is, always retains an applied purpose, and conversely applied research contains within it data for theoretical generalizations. The question is merely one of the degree of practical use, and of the breadth and depth of theoretical conclusions. For a Marxist sociologist, it is mandatory to keep in mind this principle, the unity of theory and practice. Marxist theoretical

(8) Osipov Paper, p. 622.

studies, as the Program of the CPSU emphasizes, must "light the path for practice, to help identify and remove the obstacles and difficulties which impede the successful building of communism." This approach protects the scholar from simple anecdote [illiusativnost] on the one hand and pure speculation on the other. (9)

A concrete example of this position of the new sociology can be seen in the use made of public opinion polls. A discussion of this example may throw light on the methods and plans of the field, especially since occasional references to recent Soviet work in opinion polling have appeared in the West.

The two authors most closely associated with Soviet opinion polling (B.A. Grushin and V.V. Chikin) are themselves social scientists, and their published work refers to collaboration with sociologists as well as statisticians. However, this opinion polling is not carried out or sponsored by anyone directly associated with the new Soviet sociology. Instead, its initiator and sponsor is the central daily newspaper of the Communist Youth League, *Komsomolskaia Pravda*. For this purpose, the paper organized a Public Opinion Institute of its own, the first known Soviet organization bearing any such name. The youth opinion polls are announced and conducted in the pages of *Komsomolskaia Pravda*. Some of these polls were subsequently described in separate pamphlets, and more recently in a book. (10)

The heart of the "Confessions of a Generation" poll were twelve questions published in *Komsomolskaia Pravda* in January 1961. The book on the poll states that after the twenty-day limit set for mailing replies to the newspaper, the Institute of Public Opinion analyzed the answers with the help of statistics students, researchers of the Philosophy Institute, and the main computing unit of the government's Central Statistical Administration. According to a footnote describing the statistical process, all of the answers received were coded and analyzed with the aid of sorters and computers. This was done by reducing answers to the twelve questions — most of which were open-ended — to one hundred and seventy possibilities which were then coded. Some of the statistical results are reported with specific breakdowns for occupation, age, size of community, level

(9) A. G. Zdravomyslov and V. A. Yadov, "O Programirovanii Konkretnogo Sotsialnogo Issledovaniia" (On the Programming of Concrete Social Investigations), *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVII, no. 8 (1963), p. 74.

(10) B. A. Grushin and V. V. Chikin, *Ispoved Pokoleniia* (Confessions of a Generation), (Moscow: Publishing House of the Communist Youth League, 1962).

of education, and the like. Answers to other questions are presented in gross statistical form only. (11)

A lengthy comment on the 1961 youth poll, by a Soviet sociologist — a specialist in public opinion — praised the poll's picture of the younger generation as overwhelmingly devoted to Soviet ways and ideals. But he noted the dearth of Soviet work in public opinion polling, as reflected in part in the "Confessions of a Generation." (12) The general attitude of Soviet sociology appears to go even further than this in contrasting any single research method, like opinion polling, to the catholicity of methods that it regards as one of its main sources of strength and promise. The authoritative Soviet statement at the last World Congress of Sociology leaves little doubt about this:

Some Western sociologists tend to identify concrete sociological research with the taking of popular polls. In our opinion, this is an erroneous point of view. Public polls can provide valuable results only if scrupulously prepared and conducted in conjunction with other methods of sociological research. Questionnaires are valid instruments of sociological science only if they can be compared with a mass of subjective answers to definite objective data and if they expose the natural link between objective and dependent subjective processes of comprehension. In our opinion, all information gathered from

(11) The nature of this and other youth opinion polls may be gathered from the twelve questions around which the 248-page book is built. They were worded as follows:

1. What do you think about your generation — do you like it and are you satisfied with what it is doing?
2. On what do you base your statement?
3. What, from your point of view, are the strongest features of Soviet youth? Where are they revealed most clearly?
4. Are there, in your opinion, negative features in young people that appear widely? If yes, precisely what?
5. Where do you see confirmation of your opinion?
6. What do you think is more typical of your contemporaries, purposefulness or lack of purpose?
7. Do you personally have a purpose in life?
8. What does it consist of?
9. What must you do to achieve it?
10. What have you done already?
11. Do you consider that you will attain your goal?
12. What is your conviction based on?

(12) M. Kh. Igitkhanian, "Dukhovnyi Oblik Sovetskoi Molodezhi" (The Spiritual Face of Soviet Youth), *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVII, no. 6 (1963). A translation of Igitkhanian's paper is published in *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, vol. XV, no. 39, October 23, 1963, under the title "The Methods and Purposes of Public Opinion Polls."

polls should be checked and supplemented with data gathered by other methods. (13)

The new Soviet sociology takes the same view, presumably, of a peculiarly Soviet research method described in the Osipov Paper as "discussions with workers about their sociological problems." The Merton Report refers to these discussions as mass interviews. In Soviet usage they are called "theoretical conferences." "Theoretical conferences" consist of large public gatherings in an enterprise or community being studied. These gatherings are attended by members of the groups under investigation — usually factory workers, or peasants on collective farms. They are also attended by leaders and members of research teams, as well as local officials of the Party, Government, trade unions, and youth organizations. Representatives of these participating groups speak during the "theoretical conferences."

Early in 1963 such a "theoretical conference" took place in Kalinovka, the Russian village which has received attention of late as the birthplace of Khrushchev, and as a spot which he frequently revisits. According to an extensive account in a leading scholarly journal, over 500 local residents participated in this meeting. The topic was "the upbringing of the new man in a collective farm setting." Like the scholarly commentary on the youth polling, the description of the Kalinovka theoretical conference speaks warmly of the attitudes expressed. But it does not mention any specific research techniques employed to quantify or verify the views expressed by various speakers. Nor is any sociologist or sociological center identified with the "theoretical conference." (14)

The new Soviet sociology thus appears to turn its back on any single method such as opinion polling or "theoretical conferences." At the same time, its spokesmen also emphasize that "sociological research in the U.S.S.R. is much more concerned with actual life situations than with studies under laboratory conditions." This avowal, however, appears together with an equally strong statement in favor of advanced methods of research:

We believe that the use of mathematical and statistical methods (the law of averages, the law of multitudes, the theory of games, etc.) will be fruitful in concrete social research, for they

(13) Osipov Paper, p. 622.

(14) T. I. Arkhipova and M. V. Belov, "Teoreticheskaya Konferentsiya v Sele Kalinovke" (Theoretical Conference in Kalinovka Village), *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVII, no. 5 (1963).

provide an accurate and objective description of the quantitative aspects of social processes and events. Laboratories for mathematical methods in economics created at the Section of Economics of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. and at the Siberian Section of the Academy are beginning to use mathematics more and more as a means of analysis of concrete economic processes. A large role is reserved for mathematics in modelling social processes and events as well. Economic science has already started work on social modelling, deemed a matter of the utmost importance with a promising future. Sociology is following the same course. By feeding data into an electronic computer it is possible to obtain comparisons between social events and concrete social conditions in the laboratories. (15)

The Soviet image of sociology emerges clearly when we see how the leading scholarly journals reacted to the "Sverdlovsk Study," (16) to which reference was made in the Merton Report and also in the *American Sociological Review*. (17) This volume of 550 pages grew out of extensive local investigation in Sverdlovsk, the industrial center of the Urals region, and unquestionably constituted "a first" for the field. Its topic, too, lay at the heart of the new sociology; this is well reflected in the title of the book, which in English might best be rendered as *The Growth of General Education and Vocational Training of Soviet Industrial Labor*. Despite the important topic and the unprecedented scope of the Sverdlovsk study, fellow-sociologists criticized the book sharply in their two main journals, *Voprosy Filosofii* (Questions of Philosophy) and *Filosofskie Nauki* (Philosophical Sciences). To be sure, these and other reviewers hailed the book as a significant step. Their criticisms, however, tell us a good deal about Soviet aspirations in the field.

The *Voprosy Filosofii* reviewers emphasize a point that applies to much present-day Soviet sociology. "This is the first major study of its kind. The team of authors had neither prior experience [in social research]

(15) Osipov Paper, p. 622. The extent of potential Soviet interest is reflected by a paper of a social scientist and statistician published by *Voprosy Filosofii* "for purposes of discussion:" P. P. Maslov, "Model Building in Sociological Research," *Soviet Sociology*, vol. 1, No. 1, Summer 1962, translated from *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVI, no. 3 (1962).

(16) *Podem Kulturno-Tekhnicheskogo Urovnia Sovetskogo Rabochego Klassa* (The Rise of the Cultural and Technical Level of the Soviet Working Class), edited by M. T. Yovchuk and others, (Moscow: Publishing House of Social and Economic Literature, 1961).

(17) A review of the Sverdlovsk study appears in the *American Sociological Review* for June 1963 (vol. 28, no. 3).

nor some previously worked out methods of research." The reviewers question an approach which includes the workers' political "consciousness" and their over-all orientation to society under the heading of "training." They make the point that workers might conceivably be well trained, and work well, while lacking the desired norms and values, and conversely might have these and not perform well. More generally, the review concludes that:

The book reflects some common shortcomings in the structure of scientific work [in Soviet sociology]. During the first stage of developing concrete sociological investigations in the capital, as well as in outlying areas, the research conducted was quite naturally on the same currently important subjects. This was often done without exchange of experience, without appropriate coordination of activities. Sometimes there was an unwarranted scattering of people and resources, an amateurishness in methods which is the main reason for the slight value of some of the results. [Without rigorous coordination of plans and methods, and also panel-type follow-up], research results will amount to a kind of "fly-by-night" affair, rather like the data of ordinary sporadic surveys. (18)

It is revealing that both of these major reviews of the Sverdlovsk study agree on one shortcoming of the book. As *Voprosy Filosofii* puts it, some chapters lack a theme or thesis, and limit themselves to either established propositions or pure facts. To this comment the review adds that the implied separation here between social theory and social research is wrong—each needs the other. (19) In the words of the *Filosofskie Nauki* review, the book contains too few empirical ("concrete sociological") generalizations. (20)

The significance of these particular comments lies in one question: what kind of theorizing might Soviet sociologists do — above and beyond, that is, the ever reiterated general canons of Marxism-Leninism? In this connection, a 1962 paper by a leading Soviet sociologist — G. M. Andreeva, of Moscow University — specifically brings up Merton's "theories of the middle range." Andreeva's reaction helps to explain why the Sverdlovsk study could limit itself to anecdotal evidence, descriptive statistics, and references to major official statements. As Andreeva puts it:

(18) *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVI, no. 2 (1962), p. 167.

(19) *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVI, no. 2 (1962) pp. 164, 167.

(20) *Filosofskie Nauki*, vol. 5, no. 2 (1962), p. 139.

... a quite definite purpose is assigned [to "theories of the middle range"] — to attain in sociological research a certain level of generalizations. But the suggested "level" is the level of a relatively low order of abstraction, which on principle does not go beyond empirical data. "Theoretical" knowledge on this level is again in the category of empirical knowledge, for theory itself is in essence reduced to the level of empirical generalizations . . . (21)

The same explicit opposition to "theories of the middle range" appears in the Osipov Paper to the Fifth World Congress of Sociology:

Merton's view that sociology is not yet ripe for a comprehensive integral theory and that there are only a few theories available at an intermediate level of abstraction whose significance is relative and temporary is well known.

We feel justified in believing that this definition cannot be applied to Marxist scientific sociology. The materialistic comprehension of history, first described by Marx approximately 125 years ago, has been time-tested and has been proved by the entire process of historical development. The materialistic understanding of history is based on the concrete study of social life. The emergence of Marxism in the 1840's and its further development has been organically linked to and supported by research on specific social problems. (22)

Two Leningrad sociologists recently elaborated on this theme:

Thus the [bourgeois] positivist finds himself inside a vicious circle, from which he tries to find a way out through the notorious "theory of the middle range" (R. Merton). This theory is offered as a transitional but quite independent link between empirical data and general sociological theory. The leeway for generalization in it does not go beyond the limits of a relatively narrow circle of observable phenomena. However, this attempt to construct independent "miniature theories" (H. L. Zetterberg) is clearly doomed to failure: not one of the processes we study actually exists in isolation from other processes, and the refusal to consider these interconnections leads merely to distorting the correct understanding of reality. Consequently, what matters is not whether or not "theories of the middle range" have the right to exist, but the fact that

(21) G. M. Andreeva, "Burzhuaiznaia Empiricheskaja Sotsiologija v Poiskakh Vykoda iz Krizisa" (Bourgeois Empirical Sociology Seeks a Way Out of Its Crisis), *Filosofskie Nauki*, vol. 5, no. 5 (1962), p. 39.

(22) Osipov Paper, p. 620.

they cannot exist in a vacuum, isolated from general theoretical conceptions, and out of touch with a scientific conception of history as a whole. (23)

The authoritative comments on the Sverdlovsk study suggest that rejection of "middle range" theorizing may create a very real problem for the new sociology. All of it could conceivably be as limited in scientific "pay-off" as the Sverdlovsk study was judged to be. It remains to be seen whether the field can fruitfully limit itself to scholarly fact-gathering and reaffirmation of officially moulded theory. For the moment, at least, the Soviet image of sociology seems to insist on this particular combination of science and politics.

(23) A. G. Zdravomyslov and V. A. Yadov, "O Programirovanii Konkretnogo Sotsialnogo Issledovaniia" (On the Programming of Concrete Social Investigations), *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVII, no. 8 (1963), p. 81.

A more general criticism of the structural-functional theory in contemporary American sociology appears in M. Sh. Bakhitov, "Problema Prichinnosti v Sotsiologii i Kritika Funktsionalizma" (The Problem of Causation in Sociology and the Critique of Functionalism), *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVII, no 9. (1963). On the other hand, a West German social scientist has argued the "incompatibility" between the new Soviet sociology and Western-type empirical research: René Ahlberg, "Die Sowjetische Gesellschaftswissenschaft und die Empirische Sozialforschung" (Soviet Social Science and Empirical Social Research), *Osteuropa* (Stuttgart), vol. 13, no. 10, October 1963.

CHAPTER II

Philosophers, Social Scientists, Sociologists

If in some ways the scientific aspirations of the new sociology currently run ahead of actual performance, there is also still uncertainty as to which scholars, and which scientific organizations, properly belong to the field. Like the Soviet image itself, however, this is an area of ongoing crystallization. It will help us most immediately if we can understand which Soviet scholars are called "sociologists," and why. For at present, there are three possible meanings of the term "sociology" in the U.S.S.R., and three corresponding groups of scholars who may be referred to as "sociologists."

The Merton Report already pointed to two different Soviet usages of "sociology." In one case it means all of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, and is a synonymy for Marxian social and political thought—a synonym which derives from both Marx and Lenin. This first usage enjoys wide currency today. The other meaning is "concrete sociological investigation," (24) that is, social research of an empirical kind. This use of the word is not entirely new—it goes back to the 1920's. But present Soviet statements emphasize that it is this dimension of social science that fell into special disfavor and neglect during the Stalin era, and is now being revived with particular vigor.

Yet it would be wrong to limit the question of Soviet definitions of "sociology" to this dichotomy between theory and research. First of all, "concrete sociological investigation" turns out to be a broadly conceived term, covering empirical research in all of the social sciences. Repeatedly, official and scholarly statements illustrate the fact that "concrete sociological investigation" refers to a wide variety of social research, and not to any one discipline such as sociology. For instance, this is the usage followed most often at the Academy general meeting on the social sciences in October 1962, both by the official keynote speaker, Ilichev, and by the academicians who commented on his speech. The term is used in the same way throughout the Osipov Paper to the Fifth World Congress of Sociology.

(24) **Konkretnoe Sotsiologicheskoe Issledovanie**

Beyond the fact that "concrete sociological investigation" is actually equated with social research rather than with sociology, there is a third Soviet usage that must be considered, and which comes closest to the prevailing meaning of the word "sociology" in the rest of the world. In this sense, "sociology" refers to the work of separate groups of scholars, with a distinctive set of theories and research methods, as well as institutional affiliations. In the Soviet Union, this third meaning is the least widely used.

In terms of the actual scholars involved, however, this third usage is important, since it does describe those Soviet scholars who meet the prevailing international conception of the term. These are the "sociologists" in the first sense—philosophers concentrating on the social and political philosophy of Marxism-Leninism—who are at the same time actively engaged in empirical social research. The work of this empirically oriented sub-group of philosophers is at times described as "*sociological* research," in contrast to the "*social* research" carried out by social scientists in general. (25)

Soviet philosophy as a whole deals with three types of general laws: laws of nature, personality, and society. Historical Materialism, the social philosophy of Marxism-Leninism, focuses on the general laws of society alone. "Sociology," in the third sense of the word, is in the U.S.S.R. today a branch of philosophy that also specializes in the study of the laws of society. However, it studies not only general laws but specific laws as well. This synthesizing of general laws of society with empirical research on related specific phenomena constitutes another key distinction between the new sociology and the rest of philosophy and social science.

One of the dichotomies involved here is between the new sociology and Historical Materialism. For several years, as the Merton Report mentions, a discussion went on in public and elsewhere as to how, if at

(25) An addition to this terminological heterogeneity is a further two-fold Soviet usage, which also involves sociology. Soviet scholars and officials often use the terms "social sciences" and "humanities" interchangeably. At other times, Soviet usage designates as "social sciences" only selected areas within the humanities.

"Social science" in the narrower sense covers the areas most directly linked to the Soviet conception of Marxism-Leninism. In philosophy, this means Historical Materialism, Dialectical Materialism, and the most recently established separate area of the Theory of Scientific Communism (the study of the future development of society); in economics, Political Economy (general theory and policy, as against applied economics); in history, the History of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union. All of sociology, it should be noted, falls within this second, more specialized Soviet meaning of the term "social science."

all, the dichotomy was to be seen. By now the various solutions advanced may number as many as one or two dozen, and the discussion is not yet at an end. But gradually a division of labor appears to be emerging between philosophers in Historical Materialism who deal with general laws and the partly generalizing and partly specializing sociologists. (26)

Meanwhile, however, the actual lines between these three groups of scholars—and the three meanings of “sociology”—are not at all clearly drawn. On the contrary, the same statements are likely to lump them together or to refer to them alternately. This correctly reflects the actual state of affairs. In the past few years, the new active interest in sociology has thrown the three groups together, and most discussions and undertakings relating to the subject are likely to involve spokesmen and participants from all three groups.

A major example of this is the Sverdlovsk study. It was produced by a team of scholars headed by the long-active Soviet social and political philosopher, M. T. Yovchuk, Corresponding (Associate) Member of the Academy. His closest associates were two other philosophers, Professor M. N. Rutkevich and Docent (Associate Professor) L. N. Kogan, both of the Philosophy Faculty of Ural University in Sverdlovsk. Unlike Yovchuk, Rutkevich and Kogan are themselves actively engaged in social research. (They head the Ural University's Social Research Laboratory.) Finally, much of the research for the Sverdlovsk study was undertaken by scholars from other social sciences, notably economists and education specialists.

(26) A current variant of the Historical Materialism-sociology discussion consists of revising and delineating the standard Soviet university course on Historical Materialism. Professor D. I. Chesnokov, chairman of the Historical Materialism department (*kafedra*) of Moscow University's Philosophy Faculty, contributed to this effort recently in the *Voprosy Filosofii* department headed “Discussions and Comments.” D. I. Chesnokov, “O Strukture Istoricheskogo Materializma” (On the Structure of Historical Materialism), *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVIII, no. 7 (1963).

A major earlier statement in the discussion came from Professor P. V. Rozhin, formerly Chesnokov's counterpart as chairman of the Historical Materialism department of Leningrad University, and now the Dean of the entire Philosophy Faculty at Leningrad: V. P. Rozhin, *Vvedenie v Marksistskuiu Sotsiologiu* (Introduction to Marxist Sociology), (Leningrad University Press, 1962). Rozhin returns to this and related themes in his article, “Marksizm i Konkretnye Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniia” (Marxism and Concrete Sociological Investigations), *Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta, Seriya Ekonomiki, Filosofii i Prava*, 1963, no. 3.

One of the sociologists' published contributions to this discussion is: G. V. Osipov and others, “Marksistskaia Sotsiologiya i Konkretnye Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniia” (Marxist Sociology and Concrete Sociological Investigations), *Filosofskie Nauki*, vol. 5, no. 5 (1962).

Another example of the current situation can be seen by looking at the scholars who represent the field at international scientific meetings. In recent years, this group has always included "pure" philosophers, philosophers involved in social research, and other social scientists associated with empirical studies.

Important though this three-fold distinction is in clarifying the current Soviet use of the term "sociology," a few additional points ought to be made about the various scholars involved. To begin with, the philosopher-sociologists either themselves direct the organizations now being set up or share this direction with the other philosophers. At the same time, research by other social scientists is being done either under the aegis of the philosophers, or in quite different institutions. Examples of these are research and teaching institutes in economics, education, and psychology. Thus in the realm of institutions, "social research" is apt to be associated with organizations directed by some type of philosopher and not by other social scientists.

A further point is most important. There is something of a generational difference between "pure" social and political philosophers in the Soviet Union, and the philosophers presently immersing themselves in empirical social research. The "pure" philosophers now active and predominant are in their fifties and sixties, while the philosopher-sociologists are in their early forties or (most often) in their twenties and thirties. The older philosophers do not share their involvement in field studies and new research methods. Instead, their domain remains Marxist ideology, and their writings continue to be oriented to current formulations of official doctrine.

This does not mean, however, that the two types of philosophers are altogether different from each other. First of all, the most active scholars in the younger generation are just as deeply involved as their elders in social and political philosophy, in ideology and doctrine, in Party membership and Party work. And, most immediately, they tend to share their elders' view that philosophy deals not only with the general laws of nature and man but also with the workings of society, and that sociology is properly a branch of philosophy which specializes in both the general and the specific laws of society. This is one reason why the younger generation's writings appear so similar to that of the older generation.

Furthermore, there are a number of prominent younger philosophers who stand closer to "pure" philosophy in the kind of work they do than to the new Soviet sociology. An example is furnished by the Learned

Secretary of the Philosophy Institute, Docent V. V. Mshvenieradze. Another example is Professor I. S. Kon and Docent Yu. A. Aseev of the Philosophy Faculty of Leningrad University. While the research of all three includes American sociology, the context is logic or the history of philosophy.

One last point further complicates the picture. Much of the strongest and most decisive support for the new sociology comes from "pure" philosophers and ideologists of both the older and the middle generations. The fact that the Soviet image of sociology now calls for scientific and advanced research methods cannot be ascribed to the research-oriented younger philosophers themselves. They are too few, and their work too recent, to have achieved such a significant shift in official and scholarly views.

In the present paper, the extent and nature of the current older-generation backing has already been brought out through mention of the major social science speech of Ilichev, a top Party leader and ideologist. Also notably active in supporting the new sociology are a group of ideologists who currently occupy key positions in Soviet academic life. These backers of the new sociology have held both Party and academic posts, and at present seem to stand at the pinnacle of this ideological-academic domain:

(1) Academician P. N. Fedoseev, now one of the Vice-Presidents of the Soviet Academy, and a member of the Party's Central Committee. Born in 1908, Fedoseev in the 1940's served as an official in the Central Committee secretariat. From the mid-forties on he was chief editor of the Party's main theoretical journal (*Bolshevik*, now *Kommunist*), and in the early 1950's chief editor of its organizational journal, *Partiinaiia Zhizn*. Until 1960 Fedoseev directed the Philosophy Institute of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences.

(2) Academician Yu. P. Frantsev, president of the Party's Academy of Social Sciences and also of the new Soviet Sociological Association. In the late 1940's Frantsev worked in the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and in the middle fifties as an editor of *Pravda*. Born in 1903.

(3) F. V. Konstantinov, Corresponding Member of the Academy, and present director of its Philosophy Institute. Since the 1930's Konstantinov has been in Party work. After World War II he joined the Philosophy Institute. In the mid-fifties he occupied posts in the Central Committee staff as head of the Academy of Social Sciences and then of

the "Agitprop" department. In the late 1950's Konstantinov became chief editor of *Kommunist*. Born in 1901.

It is from this intermingling and criss-crossing of philosophers, sociologists, and other social scientists that the new sociology is emerging in the Soviet Union. We can now begin to distinguish between these three groups of scholars, and the three parallel Soviet usages of "sociology." Yet we can do no more than link the new Soviet sociology with one of these groups: that of the younger social and political philosophers who in their own work stress not only general laws of society but also empirical research on more specific social phenomena related to these general laws ("sociological research"). Beyond that, crystallization has not yet gone. (27)

(27) Only one discipline in the social sciences is even less crystallized in the U.S.S.R. than sociology, and promises to remain so. This is political science. A first-hand Western account suggests some differences and similarities between the two disciplines: Gordon Skilling, "In Search of Political Science in the U.S.S.R.," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, vol. 29, no. 4, November 1963.

CHAPTER III

Scholars and Institutions

In the realm of scholarly institutions, crystallization of sociology in the U.S.S.R. also stops short of the clear-cut boundaries that are characteristic in countries where it is a separate and distinctive discipline.

The institutional locale of Soviet sociology is closely tied to the discipline of philosophy. Most scholars associated with the new Soviet sociology remain staff members of teaching or research departments in the area of Historical Materialism. (28) In addition, research units emerging during the last few years did so in and around departments of Historical Materialism. The names of these research organizations refer to social research rather than sociology, and all of them tend to include the mixture of older philosophers, younger philosopher-sociologists, and other social scientists that is so characteristic of the present stage of development.

The largest and most influential center of the new Soviet sociology is located in the Philosophy Institute of the Academy, which in turn constitutes the center of the country's scholarship in philosophy. The sociology unit within the Philosophy Institute is the Social Research Division. The name of this large "*sektor*" specifies the study of "new forms of work and daily life." Other major areas within the Philosophy Institute are Dialectical Materialism, Historical Materialism, Philosophy of Science, History of Philosophy, Psychology, and Ethics. But here, too, the lines are not drawn sharply. Depending on the particular problem under investigation, sociologists are apt to be assigned to temporary working groups in these other areas. Likewise, staff members from other areas occasionally work under the Social Research Division.

For sociology, the Philosophy Institute constitutes at one and the same time the country's main training center on the graduate level and also its main research center. Working with the Social Research Division are half a dozen or more senior research associates (equivalent to associate professors), such as V. S. Semenov, a social theory specialist inter-

(28) Like their colleagues in this particular domain, sociologists thus usually carry the academic nickname of Hist-Mat-ists (*istmatchiki*).

ested in class structure, and A. A. Zvorykin, a scholar who came to sociology from extensive economic and historical studies of technology. The Social Research Division includes another dozen or more sociologists on the junior level (equivalent to assistant professors and instructors—or to research assistants working on the Soviet counterpart to an American doctorate, the *kandidat* or Candidate's degree). This represents a larger number of full-time positions for sociologists than in any other institution. Most of these sociologists did undergraduate work in philosophy at Moscow University, and came to the Philosophy Institute for their graduate work.

The activities of the Social Research Division have been concerned with the following projects:

1. The preparation for publication in 1964 of a large work summarizing the Institute's first major field project, the "Gorky Study." Concentrating on the make-up and development of the industrial labor force of a large city on the Volga, this project has been carried out by the Institute in conjunction with Gorky University. The subject of this study and the forms of research employed are in the area of industrial sociology, with some attention to social structure and social values. A preliminary sketch of the Gorky study states:

In six of the largest enterprises of Gorky, comprehensive social research was carried out in 1960-1962 A special feature of this investigation consists in the fact that with the aid of objective and subjective sociological methods different aspects of the life of a large group of workers and members of their families were studied: [for] time budgets of working and free time, up to 2,500 people; for demographic research, up to 8,000-10,000. (29)

2. Agriculture and peasants are the object of the other major field study, being undertaken in collaboration with the Moldavian Academy of Sciences. As in Gorky, there is a mixed focus in this project, which is concerned mainly with work but also with social structure and social values.

3. A further large-scale current venture is a forthcoming collective volume on methods of social research.

(29) G. V. Osipov and others, "Marksistskaia Sotsiologiia i Konkretnye Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniia" (Marxist Sociology and Concrete Sociological Investigations), *Filosofskie Nauki*, vol. 5, no. 5 (1962), p. 30.

4. Also planned for 1964 is *Marxist and Bourgeois Sociology Today*, made up of Soviet papers presented at the Fifth World Congress of Sociology, and Soviet comments on the meeting.

A considerable number of other joint projects are under way as well, or planned. In these collaborations, the Philosophy Institute and its sociological section usually seem to act as advisers rather than partners in the field research. In a UNESCO-published article in English, two Soviet scholars listed these joint projects which the Institute co-sponsors. The list itself gives the flavor of current Soviet statements about sociological work, with their stress on the general laws of society:

- "a. Institute of Economics, Institute of Law, Institute of World Economy and International Relations, U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, on the subject: Basic Laws Governing the Development of Socialism into Communism;
- b. Academies of Science of Turkmenia, Kazakhstan, and Kirghizia—Laws Governing the Transition of Underdeveloped Countries to Socialism, Skipping the Capitalist Stage of Development;
- c. Social Science chairs of Gorky University—Technical Progress and the Working Class;
- d. The Department of Philosophy, Moldavian Academy of Sciences, and the Institute of Ethnography—Laws Governing the Cultural Advance of the Collective Farm Peasantry;
- e. Institute of Labour—Social Problems of Labour and Daily Life;
- f. Social Problems Sector, Academy of Construction and Architecture—Social Problems of Housing Construction;
- g. Institute of Economics, Siberian Branch, U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences—Problems of Overcoming the Essential Distinctions between Mental and Manual Labour, etc." (30)

The head of the Social Research Division, and one of the half dozen leading figures in the new Soviet sociology, is G. V. Osipov, a Senior Research Associate (associate professor). Formerly the Learned Secretary of the Philosophy Institute and then its Deputy Director, Osipov has done research on the social impact of technology and automation. His present

(30) G. V. Osipov and V. V. Mshvenieradze, "Sociology in the Soviet Union," International Social Science Council, *Social Science Information* (vol. 1, no. 3, October, 1962), p. 70.

The Publishing House of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences plans to publish the Gorky Study and the Moldavia village study in 1964. The books are to be entitled *Rabochii Klass i Tekhnicheskii Progress* (The Working Class and Technical Progress) and *Sotsialno-Ekonomicheskii Progress Odnogo Sela* (The Social and Economic Progress of a Village).

interests range from social theory and research methods to empirical research in the sociology of work. He directed his Institute's work on the large-scale Gorky study, soon to be published, and is co-author of the "Osipov Paper" cited in the present essay.

Another leading Soviet sociologist, who has been close to the philosophy Institute, teaches at the Institute of International Relations ("IMO"), the "West Point" of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He is Docent Yu. A. Zamoshkin, an editor of the journal *Voprosy Filosofii*. Zamoshkin specializes in theory and social psychology, and is currently doing research on "individual and collective in modern society." (31)

Besides the Philosophy Institute, the one other institution in the capital currently active in the field is the country's largest university, Moscow University. This is a development of the last couple of years. The Philosophy Faculty of the University has established a Social Research Laboratory, and a more specialized Management Research Laboratory also began functioning recently under the same Faculty.

Moscow University's work in sociology centers around two themes. One is the generally prevalent one of Soviet-type industrial and occupational sociology. In this area, a preliminary report speaks of a joint study with a group of social scientists at Saratov University. (32)

Moscow University's other current theme in sociology is what the Soviets call political sociology. This means studies of the nature and effectiveness of grassroot civic activities and public life on the local level, and the evaluation of popular participation in such activities. In both areas, the leading Moscow University sociologist has been Docent G. M. Andreeva, whose own special interests include research methods and class structure.

Also in Moscow is the graduate-level Academy of Social Sciences of the Party. This is the academic training center for the very large and unique Soviet network of Party educational institutions. So far no pub-

(31) A brief profile of Zamoshkin, and a statement by him on his work, appeared in the magazine published in English by the Soviet Embassy in Washington: Yuri Zamoshkin, "The Individual and the Collective," U.S.S.R., May 1963.

(32) A. V. Mnushkin, "Ob Opyte Metodiki Issledovaniia Protssessov Avtomatizatsii Proizvodstva v SSSR" (On a Study of Methods of Research on Automation Processes of Production in the U.S.S.R.), *Filosofskie Nauki*, vol. 5, no. 3 (1962), pp. 127-130.

lications in sociology have come from the faculty members of this institution. But the Academy of Social Sciences includes a number of older philosophers active in closely related areas. And, as already mentioned, the head of the institution, Academician Frantsev, is at the same time president of the Soviet Sociological Association.

Like the Party's Academy of Social Sciences, the Soviet Sociological Association has so far not been a major factor in the field. Unlike similar national organizations elsewhere, it is not a membership organization. Instead, it is a federation of Soviet scientific institutions engaged in one way or another in social research in the broadest sense. This means that the group embraces social scientists from various fields, as well as philosophers and sociologists. It has an annual meeting, and circulates information about social research. To date it has not begun the publication of the sociological quarterly (or annual) to which the Merton Report of 1962 refers.

Much more than in most other major countries today, in the U.S.S.R. the capital continues to dominate intellectual and scientific life. The previous capital, Leningrad, is the only city which approaches this position to some extent. And Leningrad University is second only to the Philosophy Institute as the center of the new sociology. Most of the sociological work here is done in the Social Research Laboratory, a unit of the University's Philosophy Faculty. Two other research units in closely related areas are also part of the Philosophy Faculty; these are the Laboratory of Industrial Sociology and the Laboratory of Social Psychology.

As at the Philosophy Institute and Moscow University, sociologists at Leningrad University devote most of their attention to problems related to the sociology of work. At the same time, there is a special interest here in advanced research methods and in attitudes of individuals and small groups. The director of the Social Research Laboratory is a sociologist, Docent V. A. Yadov, while the Laboratory of Social Psychology is headed by a psychologist in the Philosophy Faculty, Docent E. S. Kuzmin.

In 1963, a new social research unit typical of current Soviet trends was established in Leningrad. Growing out of an earlier city-wide "seminar" of social scientists from various Leningrad scientific institutions, this new organization is the Social Research Institute of Leningrad. It is headed by Professor F. P. Rozhin, the Dean of Leningrad University's Philosophy Faculty, and is affiliated with the Philosophy Faculty. According to an *Izvestiia* interview with Rozhin, the new Social Research Institute will function "on the public principle," that is, with a voluntary

unpaid staff. "More than 100 scientists—historians and jurists, philosophers and teachers, psychologists and economists—will take part." (33)

Outside Moscow and Leningrad, the one sociology center that has produced major work so far is Ural University in Sverdlovsk, with its Social Research Laboratory. The key sociologists at Sverdlovsk have already been mentioned in connection with the major empirical Soviet work to date in sociology. They are Professor M. N. Rutkevich and Docent L. N. Kogan. Also cited frequently in Soviet statements on sociology is the Social Research Division of the Economics Institute in Novosibirsk, where the Academy has been developing its large new Siberian Branch. The Social Research Division in Novosibirsk is headed by a labor economist and sociologist, Professor G. A. Prudensky. The work of Prudensky's unit concentrates once again on occupational and industrial sociology.

The Merton Report suggests that if the number of scholars associated with the American Sociological Association is about 6,000, "presumably, Soviet sociologists would be counted, at the most, in the hundreds rather than the thousands." (34) We should probably put the figure in the dozens.

In this connection, the matter of training is of special interest. The Merton Report emphasized that Soviet sociologists "are almost uniformly young: for the most part, men and women in their twenties and early thirties," and "are for the most part self-taught (as is of course inevitable when fresh beginnings are being made.)" The Merton Report also mentions that "there seem to be no plans greatly to increase the supply of sociologists in the U.S.S.R." (35)

At least in part due to the requirements of training, Soviet sociologists seem to be systematically concerned with teaching and studying advanced foreign methods and theory. Within the broader rationale of knowing the opponent better in order to fight him more successfully, a rationale cited earlier in the present essay, a more immediate considera-

(33) Translated in **Current Digest of the Soviet Press**, vol. XV, no. 25, July 17, 1963, p. 25 (from *Izvestia* of June 20, 1963). A similar citywide "public" Social Research Institute was established in Moscow at about the same time as Leningrad's.

(34) Merton Report, p. 3.

(35) Merton Report, pp. 3,5.

tion underlies this interest in social science abroad. As two Leningrad sociologists recently put it in an aside:

Perhaps it can be said that the organizational and technical questions of planning social research and processing the data possess not only characteristics specific to a given methodology, but also common characteristics. Therefore it is expedient to study techniques used by non-Marxist sociologists, and to adopt useful methods critically. (36)

Over the past few years, Soviet scholars have published little on sociological work in other Communist countries. (37) Some attention is paid to American sociology. Through facts-oriented formal study, there appears to be a slowly but steadily spreading familiarity with the work of major American sociologists, especially Merton, Lazarsfeld, and Parsons. (38)

(36) A. G. Zdravomyslov and V. A. Yadov, "O Programirovanii Konkretnogo Sotsialnogo Issledovaniia" (On the Programming of Concrete Social Investigations), *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVII, no. 8 (1963), p. 81n.

(37) A recent exception comes from Professor A. G. Kharchev, a leading specialist in the sociology of the family, attached to the Leningrad Branch of the Academy. Kharchev's contribution is a brief survey of "sociological research in Poland": A. G. Kharchev, "Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniia v Polshe," *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVII, no. 6 (1963).

(38) So far, materials published in the U.S.S.R. on American sociology have been largely confined to brief Soviet summaries and comments. Recently, translations of two American works have appeared. C. Wright Mills' *Power Elite* was published by the Foreign Literature Publishing House in Moscow two years after its original appearance here in 1957. (The title in Russian is *Vlastvuiushchala Elita*.) In 1961 the same Soviet publisher issued a translation of the 1954 reader edited by Howard Becker and Alvin Boskoff, *Modern Sociological Theory in Continuity and Change*. (The title in Russian is *Sovremennaiia Sotsiologicheskaia Teoriia v ee Preemstvennosti i Izmenenii*). The Becker-Boskoff translation includes a comprehensive forty-page postscript by Professor D. I. Chesnokov, chairman of the Historical Materialism department in Moscow University's Philosophy Faculty and long active as a philosopher and ideologist.

Among plans for the near future is the publication of several additional Soviet translations of American sociologists. Under consideration recently were selections from Merton's *Social Theory and Social Structure*, and *Mathematical Thinking in the Social Sciences*, edited by Lazarsfeld. Other possibilities were some writings by Parsons and also selections from the two-volume *Theories of Society*, edited by Parsons and Shils. The translation of a leading introductory textbook, such as *Sociology* by Broom and Selznick, is apparently being studied.

Also scheduled to appear (Publishing House of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, 1964) is a major monograph by Osipov, of the Philosophy Institute. To be entitled *Sovremennaiia Burzhuaznaia Sotsiologiia* (Contemporary Bourgeois Sociology), Osipov's monograph will discuss Durkheim, Weber, Simmel, Pareto, and Mannheim, and give considerable emphasis to earlier American sociologists and to present-day behavioral theory and research.

That over-all training plans may in fact be limited at the moment, or alternately that actual results are lagging behind plans, is suggested by the sharply critical comment made recently by a Soviet social scientist:

... the training of cadres in the sphere of sociological research, in our view, is proceeding unsatisfactorily. Suffice it to say that in the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences' Philosophy Institute, for example, only six graduate students are studying applied-sociology methods of work, while this year no admissions at all are planned of graduate students in this specialty. The situation is no better in other educational institutions . . . (39)

The same statement referred to two institutional matters awaiting action. One is the setting up of a separate Sociology Institute in the Soviet Union, to serve as a major research and coordinating center. Suggestions that this be done go back at least as far as 1961, when it was voiced as a recommendation of a Moscow conference of social scientists. (40) The parallel institutional development recommended is the establishment of a separate journal of sociology. At present, sociologists regard as their organs the leading philosophy journals of the country: *Voprosy Filosofii* (Questions of Philosophy), published monthly by the Academy, and *Filosofskie Nauki* (Philosophical Sciences), published every two months at Moscow University under the auspices of the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education. Now the establishment of both a separate journal and a sociology institute are being urged strongly:

The proposal made by Comrade Popov at the June plenary session of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee on creating a special sociological center in the country, assigned to work out the methodology of applied sociological research, deserves full support. Obviously, a group must be organized there to determine the methodology of the study of the practice of Party work, especially ideological work. I think the publication of a special sociological journal to acquaint the public with the results and methods of the best research in the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries, and also to index the literature on this question that comes out, would be of help. (41)

(39) V. Olshansky, "Rely on Applied Sociological Research," translated in **Current Digest of the Soviet Press**, vol. XV, no. 33, September 11, 1963, p. 9 (from *Partiinaiia Zhizn* of August 15, 1963).

(40) V. G. Smolkov, "Problema Organizatsii i Metodiki Konkretno-Sotsiologicheskikh Issledovanii" (The Problem of the Organization and Methods of Concrete Sociological Investigations), *Filosofskie Nauki*, vol. 4, no. 4 (1961), pp. 196-199.

(41) V. Olshansky, "Rely on Applied Sociological Research," translated in **Current Digest of the Soviet Press**, vol. XV, no. 33, September 11, 1963, p. 9 (from *Partiinaiia Zhizn* of August 15, 1963).

One further feature marks the present stage. The scholars and institutions involved approach the field's two stated official purposes very differently. While on the scholarly level the international objective commands a lower priority, almost every Soviet publication in the field includes frequent and sharp attacks on Western and especially American conditions, policies, and social analyses. Prominence is given to the current official crusade against "anti-communism." By "anti-communism" is meant foreign criticism of Soviet life and doctrine. All of the leading Soviet sociologists have devoted part of their writings to these topics; for example, Andreeva, Osipov, Yadov, and Zamoshkin. (42) Along with such continuing attacks on the West and "anti-communism," Soviet sociologists seldom fail to sing ardent praises of their own country and system.

A major *Voprosy Filosofii* account of the Fifth World Congress of Sociology illustrates both the nature of critical statements and the Soviet practice of intensive self-praise. The account contained several general conclusions on "bourgeois" sociology:

First of all, an attempt is being made to strengthen the effectiveness of bourgeois sociology, and to link it more closely with the broad class objectives of the capitalist state.

(42) G. M. Andreeva, "Burzhuaznaia Empiricheskaiia Sotsiologiia v Poiskakh Vykhopa iz Krizisa" (Bourgeois Empirical Sociology Seeks a Way Out of Its Crisis), *Filosofskie Nauki*, vol. 5, no. 5 (1962); also Andreeva (co-author), *Protiv Sovremennogo Revizionizma v Filosofii i Sotsiologii* (Against Contemporary Revisionism in Philosophy and Sociology), (Moscow: Publishing House of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, 1960); G. V. Osipov, "Certain Characteristics of Bourgeois Sociology in the 20th Century," *Soviet Sociology*, vol I, no. 3, Winter 1962-1963, translated from *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVI, no. 8 (1962); also Osipov, *Tekhnika i Obschestvennyi Progress* (Technology and Social Progress), subtitled "A Critical Essay on Contemporary Reformist and Revisionist Sociological Theories," (Moscow: Publishing House of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, 1959); V. A. Yadov, *Taina Lzhi* (The Secret of the Lie), (Moscow: State Publishing House of Political Literature, 1963); Yu. A. Zamoshkin, "Krizis Amerikanskoi 'Delevitosti'," (Crisis of American 'Business-like Efficiency'), *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVI, no. 11 (1962); also Zamoshkin, "Problema Amoralizma i Prestupnosti v Sovremennoi Amerikanskoi Sotsiologii" (The Problem of Amoralism and Crime in Contemporary American Sociology), *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVII, no. 7 (1963).

The first extensive bibliography of Soviet scholarly publications of this type is to be issued in 1964 by the Publishing House of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences: O. M. Klykova, *Kritika Burzhuaznoi Filosofii i Sotsiologii Epokhi Imperializma, Ukazatel Sovetskoi Literatury za 1917-1962 gg.* (Criticisms of Bourgeois Philosophy and Sociology of the Era of Imperialism, A Guide to Soviet Literature for 1917-1962). Also to appear in 1964, from the same publisher, is a work sponsored by the Philosophy Institute: M. N. Perfilov, *Kritika Burzhuaznykh Teorii o Politicheskoi Organizatsii Sovetskogo Obshchestva* (Criticism of Bourgeois Theories of the Political Organization of Soviet Society).

Secondly, the subject matter of bourgeois sociology has changed; questions of social change and development now occupy a major place. Bourgeois sociology seeks to provide answers to some large contemporary questions.

Thirdly, what is being propagandized most widely by bourgeois theories (and this depends on class demands [sotsialnyi zakaz]—on the importance of various problems and on the extent to which a given theory has not yet been exposed)—what is being propagandized most widely is the conception of “stages” of social change and of a “single industrial society.”

Fourthly, in seeking to get out of a condition of crisis, bourgeois sociology is paying ever more attention to the development and working out of theory and theoretical studies.

Fifthly, in the struggle against Marxism, bourgeois ideologists are increasingly turning to the subject of the Soviet intelligentsia, and are trying to profit by the lack of knowledge in the West about the nature and character of the development of a socialist intelligentsia.

Another part of the same account also exemplifies Soviet sociologists’ writings about the West:

. . . discussion at the Congress showed that contemporary bourgeois sociology is not closely linked either to policy or to public opinion. It can only subordinate itself to politics and political figures and carry out the orders [zakazy] of the state. Likewise, bourgeois sociology has not won respect in the eyes of public opinion.

The reason for this lies in bourgeois sociology itself—in its anti-scientific nature, its isolation from basic contemporary problems, its class content as a discipline which on the whole serves the interests of the bourgeoisie. A sociology which is fundamentally anti-scientific cannot be the scientific basis of a society’s development. A sociology which in its essence is against the people, which by and large serves a handful of monopolists and does not side with the workers and the people—such a sociology cannot enjoy the respect of public opinion.

As against these abrasive and not untypical statements about the West, the account describes as follows the Soviet participants’ impact on the Fifth World Congress of Sociology:

The work of the “Marxism” panel showed conclusively to those present how genuinely scientific were the statements of Soviet scholars and the scholars of other socialist countries, and how far removed from science were the statements of most

bourgeois sociologists. The Marxists presented the science of Marxism, while many bourgeois sociologists lived off anti-Marxist slander.

The "Marxism" panel attracted so many participants because now even more scholars of Western and the new and under-developed countries, especially young scholars, want to hear "first hand" about the triumphing scientific conception of the world, and to see what preoccupies Marxism currently and what problems it is raising and solving. They are naturally interested in Marxism as a science. And this they could hear only from Marxist sociologists, not from the slanderers of Marxism. It is precisely for this reason that Marxist sociologists could see and feel that they were listened to attentively, that they were understood, that they were supported. Hundreds of participants found out the truth about Marxism, its creative character, its service to mankind, its humanism. (43)

In part, a similar theme concludes a revised *Voprosy Filosofii* version of the Osipov Paper for the Fifth World Congress of Sociology:

In view of [the fact that the World Congress illustrated that some sociologists abroad are engaged in interesting empirical research but that all bourgeois ideology calls for rejection], one task stands out again and again as the chief result of the Fifth World Congress of Sociology. This is the deeply scientific working out of current problems of Marxist-Leninist sociology on the basis of empirical social research, and the systematic irreconcilable struggle of ideas against the anti-scientific and

(43) V. S. Semenov, "Na V Vsemirnom Sotsiologicheskom Kongresse, Obzor i Analiz Raboty" (At the Fifth World Congress of Sociology, A Survey and Analysis of its Work), *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVI, no. 11 (1962), pp. 22, 34.

The same issue of *Voprosy Filosofii* contains a leading article on the Fifth World Congress of Sociology, by the head of the Soviet delegation to the meeting: F. V. Konstantinov, director of the Philosophy Institute, "Sotsiologiya i Politika" (Sociology and Politics). This article combines a general commentary on the meeting, similar to that just quoted, with the author's contribution to the World Congress panel of sociologists, policy makers, and the public. Selected papers from this panel, and also that on Marxism, appear in *Transactions of the Fifth World Congress of Sociology*, vol. III (Louvain: International Sociological Association, 1963).

A Soviet participant's account of the preceding international sociological meeting, in Stresa in 1960, parallels the Semenov and Konstantinov statements: B. A. Chagin, "IV Mezhdunarodnyi Sotsiologicheskii Kongress i Nekotorye Voprosy Sovremennoi Burzhuanznoi Sotsiologii" (The Fourth World Congress of Sociology and Certain Questions of Contemporary Bourgeois Sociology), in *Voprosy Marksistskoi Sotsiologii* (Questions of Marxist Sociology), edited by V. P. Rozhin (Leningrad University Press, 1962).

anti-Marxist conceptions of bourgeois sociology and above all against those of its conceptions which "substantiate" the reactionary ideology of anti-communism. (44)

Within such an emphatically political context, Soviet science can, in sum, point to a number of recognized scholars and institutions which today embody the new sociology. In Moscow, this means the Philosophy Institute and Moscow University, and such scholars as Andreeva, Osipov, Semenov, Zamoshkin, and Zvorykin. In Leningrad the old capital's university stands out, and the group around Yadov. In the area of the country's "frontier," there is Ural University in Sverdlovsk, with Rutkevich and Kogan, and in Novosibirsk the Academy's new Siberian Institute of Economics and its labor economist-sociologist Prudensky. Two other Moscow sociologists are also often mentioned: E. A. Arab-Ogly and Y. N. Semenov.

At the same time, the small numbers involved in full-time sociological work in the Soviet Union, the possible lag in training still younger specialists to work with the "self-taught" first generation of recent years, the unsettled questions regarding the establishment of separate scientific organizations and publications for sociology, the rather different approach to international as against domestic topics—all these things (together with the continuing flux between philosophers, sociologists, and social scientists) demonstrate how incomplete the crystallization of the field remains.

(44) M. T. Yovchuk and G. V. Osipov, "O Nekotorykh Teoreticheskikh Printsipakh, Problemakh i Metodakh Sotsiologicheskikh Issledovaniï" (On Some Theoretical Principles, Problems, and Methods of Sociological Research), *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVI, no. 12 (1962), p. 34. Likewise, the theme recurs in an illuminating summary statement, addressed to the general reader in the United States: G. V. Osipov and V. N. Kolbanovsky, "Sociology in the New Society," *U.S.S.R.*, April 1963. While the statement makes no reference to the West, it underscores the unique methods and tasks of Soviet sociologists.

CHAPTER IV

A Sociology of Work

Though international topics are emphasized in the programs and writings of the new Soviet sociology, they do not loom large in its scholarly work. On this level, social phenomena abroad command a distinctly lower priority than do the same phenomena within the country. The ongoing research of Soviet sociologists is deeply ethnocentric; it is wholly immersed in Soviet life. Systematically selected and officially approved, these ethnocentric areas are summarized in the Osipov Paper. In this paper, the key areas fall under the following headings:

1. The alteration of the social structure of society in the process of building Communism.
2. Modifications in the character of work.
3. The transfer of Socialist State functions to public self-governing organizations.
4. Soviet family life and functions in relation to living space and [to] material and social conditions.
5. The spiritual life of people and the maximum development of personality.

However, some important qualifications must be made here. This list speaks of social research in the U.S.S.R., and not specifically of sociology. As far as the field of sociology goes, the key areas today are fewer in number. To begin with, the sociology of the family (area 4) is currently by and large the subject of research by Soviet psychologists and educators, rather than sociologists. Similarly, the area of values and personality (area 5) is beginning to produce social research by philosophers in the area of ethics, as well as in the currently reviving field of social psychology. The traditionally physically oriented Soviet field of ethnography is also moving in the direction of social research related to both family life and values. Aside from a marginal involvement in connection with its central pursuits, sociology has not emphasized such

research. A final qualification concerns area 3. In this area—which Soviet usage equates with political sociology—there is some active research by sociologists. But of the major centers only Moscow University appears to be engaged in this research, and even here work is just beginning.

A recent *Voprosy Filosofii* editorial leaves no doubt at all that the field does indeed single out industrial and occupational sociology at the expense of these other areas:

However, the sphere of empirical sociological research remains rather narrow. Studied most intensively are problems connected with the growth of the scientific and technical level of workers and employees, the increase in leisure time, and the merging of mental and physical labor. Yet philosophers continue to speak only in general terms, operating with randomly chosen facts, about such all-important social processes in our life as the transformation of the CPSU into the party of the whole people and the growth of its leadership role, as well as the increasing role of civic organizations and subjective factors in building communism. (45)

Why is the officially blessed new sociology today in fact a sociology of work? The answers to this question are deeply rooted in the nature of Soviet society and Soviet politics. At least four reasons of basic importance can be mentioned:

1. The Soviet Union is the first major society in man's history which is catapulting into advanced industrialization from a social and cultural foundation which quite recently was largely non-modern. Inevitably, therefore, Soviet society even today contains a large number and variety of what Soviet usage calls "vestiges of capitalism"—values and behavior patterns incompatible either with modern industrial society in general or with its singular Soviet variant in particular. Nowhere are such incompletely modern patterns of behavior likely to matter so much in a rapidly industrializing society as in the area of work, and particularly factory work in a relatively novel urban and technological setting. Since the Soviet Union has consistently placed industrial output and labor

(45) Editorial, "KPSS—Partiia Vsego Naroda" (The CPSU is the Party of the Whole People), *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVII, no. 8 (1963), p. 11.

One of the fields in which Soviet sociologists are beginning to do empirical research is esthetics: A. K. Melekhova, "Opyt Sotsiologicheskogo Issledovaniia Esteticheskikh Vzgliadov i Vkusov Rabochikh Promyshlennykh Predpriatii Urala" (An Essay in Sociological Investigation of the Esthetic Views and Tastes of Workers in Industrial Enterprises in the Urals), *Filosofskie Nauki*, vol. 6, no. 5 (1963).

productivity above popular involvement in either private life or public life, the area of work becomes all the more important. By the same token, this area becomes all the more logical as the focus of the Soviet type of policy-oriented, problem-solving science.

2. Closely related to this is the Soviet conception of how to socialize or re-socialize a population that was in part unprepared for the grandiose tasks and rigorous procedures of the Soviet system, and in part resistant to them. Soviet theory and practice has approached this problem in large measure through the area of work. The novel, collective, and demanding nature of work in a revolutionary and modernizing society, and especially in industry, in the Soviet conception became the ideal means by which to transform the population, by which to create the New Soviet Man.

Socialist Competition and similar publicized ventures are only part of this Soviet conception. From the outset, policy makers and social scientists in the Soviet Union thought of all aspects of work as a unique and invaluable "school for communism." Much of the new sociology is aimed at a systematic analysis of which policies and practices contribute most to making a maximally effective "school for communism" out of work.

3. Demography plays a notable role in the Soviet preoccupation with industrial and occupational sociology. Because of the rigors of forced industrialization and collectivization, and the unrivalled population losses of World War II, Soviet population increase ever since the 1930's has been slower than it was in the 1920's. At the same time, an unevenly modernizing agriculture continues to retain a significant share of the country's manpower, while another sizable portion of the labor force consists of unskilled rather than skilled factory workers. Together with the ever-growing complexity of advanced technology and industrial life in general, all this puts a special premium in the Soviet Union on work and in particular on the recruitment, training, utilization, and productivity of skilled industrial labor. Each of these aspects of labor policy can and does have a close link to an industrial sociology like the Soviet one.

4. Only after considering these basic social, economic, and demographic factors is it proper for us to turn to recent political developments in seeking explanations for the focus of the new Soviet sociology. Within this broader context, the transformation of the "absolute totalitarianism" to Stalin into the "enlightened" rule of Khrushchev has played a decisive role. Most specifically, the past decade has involved a two-fold change. On the one hand, there has been a definite nation-wide shift from heavily

coercive policies to policies emphasizing material and moral appeals. On the other hand, the post-Stalin leadership has sought to soften the popular impact of its continually rigorous policies by a variety of new, more flexible and more gentle mechanisms.

For post-Stalin leadership, as for its predecessors, unceasing industrial expansion remains the keystone—both to create the good society of the future and for present-day success at home and abroad. For this reason, much of the policy-making of the past decade has concentrated on questions directly related to industrial manpower and labor productivity. And much of the search for less harsh, more popular policies has perforce also focused on industry and on factory workers. In this all-important groping toward more subtle, more sophisticated policies, the new social science has been regarded as necessary and helpful. For no matter how slowly or unevenly official theories and practices might change, these leaders were clearly conscious of the aridity and inutility of the Stalin-era social sciences; this point is brought out in the already-cited Ilichev speech to the Soviet academicians, and in numerous other official statements. What was wanted in the place of the former situation was a group of scholars every bit as loyal and disciplined, but at the same time more sophisticated, original, and enterprising in their policy recommendations.

The youthful and often able pioneers of present-day Soviet sociology closely fit the needs of present policy. All of them are dedicated Party members and active policy advisors on one level or another. All of them appear to share their leaders' impatience with pure Stalinism in policy and scholarship, as they do their urgent search for adaptations of the system to an ever more complex society and a rapidly changing world. And it is in the area of work—of how to assure increased labor productivity—that the new Soviet sociology seems to be called upon to make its central contribution to post-Stalin policies.

These, then, are some of the fundamental reasons why Soviet sociologists are devoting themselves today so largely to the sociology of work. They explain, too, the particular ways in which the subject is approached.

During its first few years the new Soviet sociology showed some definite structural similarities with American research in occupational and industrial sociology. In both countries, early research focused on a limited number of problems and methods. In both countries, labor economics played a major role at the outset—the Institutional School of Thorsten Veblen, John R. Commons, Selig Perlman and others in the

United States; the now venerable Academician S. G. Strumilin and the labor studies of the 1920's in the Soviet Union. (46) In both countries, the study of leisure can be seen as a contemporary approach to work in a changing setting. Finally, in both countries there is at present a preoccupation with the revolutionary impact of the latest technological changes, notably automation. And if Marxist theory and empirical research are conceived of as an organic whole in the Soviet Union, in the United States occupational and industrial sociology moved over the years toward synthesizing the European tradition of theoretical and historical breadth with the American tradition of specialization and comprehensive field studies.

Along with these similarities, a host of differences persists. Among these, few are more important than that of orientation toward research. In their report, Merton and Riecken conclude:

The Soviet orientation toward empirical social research might be described as "practical empiricism": As an effort to obtain just enough systematic information on which to base recommendations for policy and action, with little interest in pursuing, through empirical research, the more theoretical implications of what has been observed. In spirit and outcome, it is most like market-research in the United States: on a low level of abstraction, and largely confined to ferreting out facts that can be taken into account in making practical decisions.

At present, the range of practical problems attacked by sociological investigation is mostly limited to problems connected with industrial work and education. The many specific examples of research under way or just completed can almost all be encompassed under the single heading: the engineering of social change. (47)

Beyond this research orientation toward "practical empiricism" and "the engineering of social change," another difference looms large between

(46) A perceptive appreciation of Strumilin appears in R. W. Davies, "Some Soviet Economic Controllers - I," *Soviet Studies* (Oxford), vol. XI, no. 3, January 1960, pp. 286-296. According to the author, Strumilin manifested the same absorption with regulating over-all social change—as against studying or evaluating it—that characterizes at least some of the leading sociologists in the U.S.S.R. today.

What the balance between the sociology of work and other branches of the field was in earlier Soviet research may soon be outlined systematically for the first time, in a major guide to be issued in 1964 by the Publishing House of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences: *Filosofiiia v SSSR, Bibliografiia Knig i Broshur po Voprosam Filosofii za Period 1917-1962 gg.* (Philosophy in the U.S.S.R., Bibliography of Books and Pamphlets on Philosophical Questions for the Period of 1917-1962).

(47) Merton Report, p. 4.

Soviet and American research on the sociology of work. Increasingly, American research attempts to embrace three different levels of the work situation: the individual, the group of which he is a part, and the organization in which he works. On each of these levels, there is a further emphasis on two components, labor and management. Moreover, attention is often paid to the role of mediating agencies like unions and government on the one hand and the individual personality on the other.

In the past few years, the research of Soviet sociologists has covered only a few of these topics. The Merton Report noted the limited emphasis on the group. The exceptions to this limitation lie in the area of officially sponsored collective endeavors, notably Socialist Competition and in recent years also the Brigades of Communist Labor. But even these exceptions so far have received only partial attention from the new sociology. Even less subject to systematic study is the whole organizational level, be it economic management, the unions, or Party and government organizations per se. These organizations enter into the picture only as generalized sources of policies, plans, and decisions, but not as an element to be studied alone or in terms of its interaction with individual workers or groups of workers.

Still another aspect of this Soviet-American difference pertains to personality studies of workers. In 1963, a major collection of essays on this subject was published by the Psychology Division of the Soviet Academy's Philosophy Institute. Part of the research included grew out of the comprehensive Gorky study of Osipov's Social Research Division in the same institute. This suggests that the Gorky study itself and other forthcoming publications in this area may well include personality studies. To date, however, they have not been among the major ingredients of Soviet sociological research on work. Nor do these essays go as far in depth analysis or documentation as comparable American studies. (48)

A leading sociologist, A. A. Zvorykin of the Philosophy Institute, describes the shortcomings of the initial Soviet research on work, as he sees them:

Unfortunately, the generalization of practical experience accumulated on the job and the scientific elaboration of labor

(48) O Chertakh Lichnosti Novogo Rabochego (On the Personality Characteristics of the New Worker), edited by K. K. Platonov (Moscow: Publishing House of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, 1963). Two essays in the volume refer specifically to the Gorky study: V. I. Bashilov, on the stimulation of inventions by workers, and N. G. Valentinova, on the rôle of personality in overcoming the monotony of assembly line work.

problems generally lag as yet and constitute a backward area of theoretical work.

. . . . The opinion is still common that sociological studies have no direct relationship to research into labor problems Studies of the psycho-physiological aspects of the labor process cannot be effective if they do not take into consideration the influence of the individual upon the labor processes and do not investigate social problems of [work].

. . . . Whereas numerous large research institutions are engaged in studying long-range prospects for the development of techniques and technology, problems of labor . . . are the concern of a small number of organizations, and their activity is virtually uncoordinated.

In the same paper, Zvorykin also enumerates specific aspects of work that preoccupy him and his colleagues in the field:

Work and equipment; work and the organization of production; work and the cultural-technical level of workers; eliminating the differences between mental and physical work; the conversion of agricultural work into a variety of industrial work; work as the basis of upbringing the younger generation; the transformation of socialist work into communist work and the role of the most advanced ideology in the process—these are by no means a complete list of the problems involved in the development of work and the influence of changes in its nature upon the shaping of the man of communist society. (49)

In terms of its initial research, what the new sociology explores is above all the individual worker. The focus has been the worker's desire and ability to adapt himself to rapidly changing technology. Part of the analysis is on the level of short-run needs, and part of it reaches out towards things to come. Within this duality, the sociology of work commands the center of the stage. The main themes of this Soviet sociology of work are: the impact of technological change, the education and training of industrial labor, and attitudes toward work. Beyond that, the social theory of Soviet sociologists concentrates on a closely related subject, class structure.

(49) A. Zvorykin, "Approaches to Work under Communism," *Soviet Sociology*, vol. 1, no. 2, Fall 1962, pp. 33-35, 29 (translated from *Voprosy Ekonomiki*, 1962, no. 7).

CHAPTER V

Research: Technology and Training

Current Soviet writings, both official and scholarly, place very great emphasis on technological change. Such change appears as the single most important factor in assuring material prosperity and superior working conditions in which drudgery is minimized and productivity maximized. Beginning with Marx, technology received emphasis as a key element in determining and altering economic relations, and hence social relations as well. Extrapolating from this view, present Soviet writings give technology pride of place, and assign to it a vast influence on all social change.

With industry usually singled out in Soviet writings, the main theme is that of the all-important reciprocal impact of technological change and industrial labor—the training, as well as the productivity, of factory workers. Technological change both requires and makes possible a much higher level of vocational training and industrial output. This improved training and productivity, in turn, must lead to still greater technological change.

Over the past few years, Andreeva and other sociologists at Moscow University, working together with a provincial institution, Saratov University, have conducted a study on the influence of automation on Soviet workers. (50) In reporting part of this study, and going on to discuss the causes of social change, Andreeva repeatedly emphasizes technology. Thus “the progress of technology constitutes the general material basis for the liquidation of important differences between mental and physical labor.” And, she continues, “the decisive condition for this is the automation of production.” (51)

(50) A. V. Mnushkin, “Ob Opyte Metodiki Issledovaniia Protssessov Avtomatizatsii Proizvodstva v SSSR” (On a Study of Methods for Research on Automation Processes of Production in the U.S.S.R.), *Filosofskie Nauki*, vol. 5, no. 3 (1962), pp. 127-130.

(51) G. M. Andreeva, “Avtomatizatsiia Proizvodstva i Stiranje Sotsialnykh Granits Mezhdru Rabochim Klassom i Inzhenerno-Tekhnicheskoi Intelligentsiei” (The Automation of Production and the Eradication of Social Distinctions between the Working Class and the Engineering and Technical Intelligentsia), *Filosofskie Nauki*, vol. 4, no. 4 (1961), p. 26.

Much of the writing of Zvorykin also revolves around technological change. He describes in some detail the nature and extent of this change, and the effect it is currently having on the functions of skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled industrial labor in the U.S.S.R. Although he echoes the recurrent emphasis of Soviet officials and scholars on the overwhelmingly beneficial and progressive role of technological change, he also specifies some difficulties that may develop in the process. The following excerpt also illustrates both the frequent recourse of Soviet sociologists to anecdote, and the emphasis on "practical empiricism" and the "engineering of social change" prevalent in such comments:

Along with the progressive changes described in the foregoing, concerning the material content of labor, there will also appear certain negative phenomena having to do with new types of fatigue resulting from the servicing of automated equipment. Under the conditions of automated production, muscular fatigue is sharply reduced or disappears completely; on the other hand, the nervous tension of the workers rises greatly. The chief dispatcher of the city power plant in Gorky, engineer A. G. Gruzdev says: "We do no physical work but fatigue remains. It is a consequence of concentration of attention, the need to strain our imagination in order to conceive of what is going on behind the control panel. The conditions of operation of a power system change constantly and the dispatcher must be attentive at all times. He bears an enormous responsibility for uninterrupted supply of current to numerous enterprises. He must always be ready to make a necessary decision. He is always under tension."

It goes without saying that administration of a large power system requires a great deal more tension than supervision over an automatic line connecting only a number of machine tools. However, as all-round automation progresses, labor in all spheres of production will be determined to an increasing degree by circumstances analogous to those described above. This involves new and important problems in perfecting the organization of work and making it easier under conditions of automated production. (52)

(52) A. Zvorykin, "Approaches to Work under Communism," *Soviet Sociology*, vol. I, no. 2, Fall 1962, p. 30 (translated from *Voprosy Ekonomiki*, 1962, no. 7). Zvorykin deals with the same subject in: *Ot Sotsializma k Kommunizmu* (From Socialism to Communism), edited by P. N. Fedoseev and others (Moscow: Publishing House of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, 1962), pp. 352-374. Zvorykin returns to this and related subjects in his book, *Nauka, Proizvodstvo, Trud* (Science, Production, Work), which the Publishing House of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences plans to issue in 1964.

While technological change is singled out as the causal factor in Soviet sociological work, it is the realm of workers' schooling that has so far produced the most empirical data. This is apt to be true regardless of the theme of a research product—whether it is technological change, work attitudes, class structure, or training itself.

A notable example is the Sverdlovsk study. The first part of the present essay has already quoted leading Soviet reviews of this study, to the effect that the book was deficient on two major scores: failing to explicate its research methods and failing to make generalizations on the basis of its concrete findings. Yet despite serious shortcomings, the Sverdlovsk study is typical of much of the recent output of Soviet sociology. And the fact that this comprehensive early work is devoted to workers' schooling underlines the predominance of the theme in current empirical research by Soviet sociologists.

Chapter IV of the Sverdlovsk study is representative of the book. The chapter's subject is "young recruits to the working class." Alongside with the customary citations from the classics of Marxism-Leninism and recent official pronouncements—and a tone of unqualified enthusiasm about the progress being made—there are two types of documentation. First, there are a characteristic series of anecdotes about individual workers. These anecdotes give the worker's name and place of work, and then a very brief account of the kind just quoted. The other type of documentation that goes beyond general official statements consists of statistical tables. Chapter IV of the Sverdlovsk study contains eleven such tables. The majority derive from unpublished materials of local education and labor offices in Sverdlovsk and another industrial center nearby, Nizhnii Tagil. Most of the other tables sum up questionnaire data. Few if any of these tables cover large numbers of workers. Nor do they give either the precise meaning of the categories into which the data has been broken down, or the manner in which the data was assembled. The bulk of these tables contain absolute figures as well as percentages.

The kind of original quantitative data that the Sverdlovsk study provides can be seen from the following examples. The first statistical table of Chapter IV deals with increases in the number of Nizhnii Tagil high school graduates who go to work as against those entering vocational schools or colleges. Of 667 graduates in 1954, 22.6% took jobs while 72.3% went on to vocational schools or college. In 1958, the last year shown, there were 1,458 graduates and the percentages changed to 41.8% and 48.8% respectively. (The balances consist of graduates going into military service or supported by their parents.) Table 5 shows that in-

training secondary schools for young workers are beginning to have more students than local high schools. Thus in Nizhnii Tagil 1,500 are enrolled in the graduating class of the regular high school, while 1,600 are in the same class in the young workers' school.

Table 6 is based on a different kind of source, the unpublished stenographic record of a local Young Communist meeting. This table shows that between 1952 and 1958 the number of high school graduates among young workers (under 25) at the Nizhnii Tagil metallurgical factory complex (*kombinat*) rose from 1.1% to 18.4%. Table 9 shows that industrial professional courses in Sverdlovsk province in 1958 enrolled 25,878 trainees, of whom 18.4% had already completed secondary education, 56.5% finished junior high school, and the rest had completed grade school or a year or two more. According to Table 11, the number of workers at the Nizhnii Tagil metallurgical factory complex graduating from the *kombinat's* own secondary school rose from a 1951 total of 33 and 24 (junior high and high school) to 492 and 570 in 1960. (53)

The reason why workers' schooling receives so much emphasis in the new Soviet sociology is brought out by Andreeva's preliminary report on Moscow University research concerning the effect of technological change on class structure. The role of automation is crucial and yet also not to be exaggerated. "If it is kept in mind that at the factory studied only 2% of the ball-bearing production is automated at present, and at the end of the seven-year plan [in 1965] 80% of the production will be automated, it becomes clear that the general cultural and technical growth of the whole collective of workers will take place together with the growth of automation." But, Andreeva adds, automation "only creates the possibility of eradicating these social lines [between workers and engineers]." Something else is needed. "Thus, for example, by itself automation does not create the concrete means of raising the general education and vocational training of the working class."

Here and there Andreeva's preliminary account produces statistical data obtained from interviewing and otherwise studying 150 workers in the State Ball-bearing Factory no. 1 in Moscow, 25 of them in an automated shop and the other 125 in three not-yet automated shops. One of the documented findings is that "at present the cultural and technical level

(53) **Podem Kulturno-Tekhnicheskogo Urovnia Sovetskogo Rabochego Klassa** (The Rise of the Cultural and Technical Level of the Soviet Working Class), edited by M. T. Yovchuk and others, (Moscow: Publishing House of Social and Economic Literature, 1961). Table 1 of Chapter IV is on p. 166 of the Sverdlovsk study, Table 5 is on p. 176, Table 6 on p. 177, and Table 9 on p. 190.

of the basic mass of the factory's workers is still not sufficiently high"—and that in this sense the figures show that the average number of years during which workers received general schooling is around six in the non-automated shops (5.8%, 5.93%, 6.02%) and 6.7 in the automated shop. Andreeva adds that

these figures do not reveal very much, since in the automated shop there is a relatively large number of old skilled workers, who have been here since the shop was established and whose level of education (in connection with their age) is considerably lower than what is typical for the average age. Yet it is precisely in the automated shop that the number of workers is relatively large who are studying in vocational high schools or institutions of higher education (25 persons, with the smallest total number of workers per shop). (54)

Zvorykin also throws light on workers' schooling through considering the "rationalization movement," or the proposal by workers of technological improvements:

. . . in examining the role of school education in the process of shaping of work cadres, certain contradictory phenomena are encountered. At a conference of higher educational institutions held in Sverdlovsk in 1961 a paper was presented on the results of a special large-scale selective investigation into the level of general and production training of workers and the influence upon their participation in the movement of rationalizers. The study was carried out by E. L. and L. F. Pysin.

In a group of workers with identical job classification and work experience, those with a high level of education normally are more active as rationalizers. However, if workers are grouped by level of education independent of their years of work experience, a phenomenon occurs that at first glance appears to be paradoxical: the lower the level of education, the more workers participate in the rationalization movement. Thus, among workers having 5 or 6 years of schooling, 30.8% participate in this movement; among those with 7 to 9 years 26.6%; while among the total number having secondary and incomplete higher education only 21.2% participate.

Thus we find that the higher the level of education of the workers, the fewer the rationalization proposals they submit. This "law" finds an exception only in the category of workers

(54) G. M. Andreeva, "Avtomatizatsiia Proizvodstva i Stiranie Sotsialnykh Granits Mezhdu Rabochim Klassom i Inzhenerno-Tekhnicheskoi Intelligentsiei" (The Automation of Production and the Eradication of Social Distinctions between the Working Class and the Engineering and Technical Intelligentsia), *Filosofskie Nauki*, vol. 4, no. 4 (1961), p. 32.

who have completed 4-year schools, among whom 23.8% are rationalizers, which is lower than among those of 5-6 and 7-9 year education although higher than among workers with secondary and incomplete higher education. This is explained by the fact that during their first five years on the job young workers manifest little creative initiative and it is only after a certain amount of time has elapsed that they come to occupy a leading place among rationalizers. And among working personnel in industry, workers with a high level of general education generally have as yet insignificant production experience. (55)

Why does participation in the "rationalization movement" appear to drop with increased education? Zvorykin's matter-of-factly empirical explanation contrasts strikingly with the way Andreeva accounts for the same phenomenon.

In the report just cited, Andreeva finds that the savings growing out of technological improvements suggested by workers are considerably lower in the automated shop than in the three other shops studied (49 rubles per 100 workers as against 272, 298, and 153 rubles). But instead of attempting a practical explanation for this, Andreeva starts by attacking "pessimistic" Western interpretations of the impact of automation on workers, and cites the industrial sociology of Georges Friedman. Thereafter she affirms that the impact of automation is bound to be detrimental under Capitalism and, conversely, inevitably beneficial under Socialism. Hence, in the U.S.S.R. automation cannot possibly reduce workers' creativity, although the figures suggest this. The author closes the discussion by quoting Marx on a related subject. (56)

Whether Soviet writings follow Andreeva's kind of analysis or Zvorykin's, there can be little doubt why so much of the actual research and comment by the new sociology are devoted to technological change and workers' schooling. In the U.S.S.R. today, all doctrine and social theory picture these two factors together as nothing less than the *deus ex machina* building communism and transforming present Soviet society into the blueprint of tomorrow.

(55) A. Zvorykin, "Approaches to Work under Communism," **Soviet Sociology**, vol. I, no. 2, Fall 1962, p. 32 (translated from *Voprosy Ekonomiki*, 1962, no. 7).

(56) G. M. Andreeva, "Avtomatizatsiia Proizvodstva i Stiranie Sotsialnykh Granits Mezhdru Rabochim Klassom i Inzhenerno-Tekhnicheskoi Intelligentsiei" (The Automation of Production and the Eradication of Social Distinctions between the Working Class and the Engineering and Technical Intelligentsia), **Filosofski Nauki**, vol. 4, no. 4 (1961), p. 32.

CHAPTER VI

Research: Attitudes to Work

Compared to technology and training, the theme of work attitudes has not received much specific attention from Soviet sociologists. Not that it is slighted altogether. On the contrary, in terms of both the New Soviet Man of the future and labor's contribution to present economic goals, this theme is all-important. But research tends to deal with it not directly but tangentially—through studies of the impact of technology, of education and training, and of a changing class structure.

Partly conforming to this pattern in Soviet sociology, and partly the major exception to it, is the recent research on time budgets of workers and leisure time. While this subject does not necessarily involve work attitudes directly, in the U.S.S.R.—and elsewhere, as well—the connection has in fact been a close one. As a result, the most extensive empirical data on attitudes to work comes from studies of workers' leisure and time budgets.

The rationale for Soviet research in this area is spelled out by Prudensky, the labor economist and sociologist:

In addition to [other consequences of greater leisure], free time, as one of the conditions for the development of the human personality, is a powerful factor in improving labor productivity. It is in this sense that Marx termed free time one of the greatest productive powers of labor. Thus, working and free time are interrelated and mutually conditioned concepts.

That is why it is so important to have a more accurate accounting, in all economic and social life, of both the working time and the free time of the working people. The study and rational utilization of free time is a task of major national importance in the development of our society.

Citing research in Siberia, where his own Economics Institute of the Academy is located (in Novosibirsk), Prudensky offers a picture typical of recent Soviet writings, including that of sociologists:

The most significant changes have occurred not in the quantity of free time, but in its structure, inasmuch as the 8-hour day

existed until recently. According to data of Academician S. G. Strumilin, male workers spent 7.85 hours per month on studies in 1924, while women spent 5.54 hours. By now, however (or, to be more exact, when the 8-hour day was still in effect), the time spent by workers in studies in Krasnoïarsk Territory has doubled on the average, and comprises 15 to 20 hours per month. Moreover, a great many combine work on the job with study. They spend from 85 hours per month (women) to 100 hours and more (men) on the latter. In this same Krasnoïarsk Territory a study was made of the time budget of 1,092 workers in heavy industry. It was found that even on week-days they have an average of about 3 hours free time (a bit more for men, and 25 to 30% less for women). Virtually identical data have been derived from a number of enterprises in other cities of Siberia, Novosibirsk and Stalinsk in particular. However, it must not be forgotten that we are speaking of Siberia — a newly-industrialized area of the country, and not the old, developed cultural and industrial centers, where the workers enjoy even more free time. Thus, according to data of the Central Statistical Administration of the R.S.F.S.R., the free time per adult in the family of a Moscow worker is one hour more per day than that of a Siberian.

During the last two or three decades free time has come to be utilized differently. Time spent on religious rites, on playing cards, and the like, to which no small amount of time was devoted in 1924, has disappeared entirely from the time budgets of workers studied in 1958 and 1959. At the same time, working people have come to spend more time on improving their cultural level: reading newspapers, magazines, fiction and poetry, attending the theater, motion pictures, watching television, sports, educating children, and so forth.

Analysis of the free time of the most advanced production workers is highly suggestive. It was found, for example, that the members of 30 Siberian Communist Labor Brigades devote considerably more free time than other workers to studies and civic activities (4 to 5 times as much), and reading fiction and poetry (twice as much).

By comparison with the past, there has been a significant reduction in the difference in basic expenditures of free time as between working women and men. Whereas in 1924 men had three times as much time for formal study and self-education as women, in 1959 they had only 50% more. Changes such as these have been induced chiefly by the fact that in recent years working women have found it possible to give somewhat less time to housework. (57)

(57) G. A. Prudenskii, "The Free Time of Working People in Socialist Society," *Soviet Sociology*, vol. 1, no. 1, Summer 1962, pp. 32, 33 (translated from *Kommunist*, 1960, no. 15).

The technically and statistically most comprehensive Soviet publication on the subject comes from Leningrad University's Social Research Laboratory under Yadov. This research was reported in 1961, with more than usually precise definitions of the sample surveyed and the data sought. Of equally great interest are the fourteen statistical tables that accompany the relatively brief research paper. A list of these statistical tables suggest their scope:

1. Time Budgets of Workers, Engineering-Technical Personnel and Office Employees
2. Free-Time Budget of Workers and Engineering-Technical Personnel
3. Free-Time Budget of Workers and Engineering-Technical Personnel in the 31-40 age group
4. Time Budgets of Men and Women
5. Free Time of Men and Women
6. Relationship of Time Budget to Age
7. Free-Time Budgets Related to Age Groups
8. Free-Time Budgets of Party Members, Komsomol Members, and Non-Party People
9. Free-Time Budgets of Students and Non-Students
10. Non-Working Time of Persons Engaged in Study and Non-Students
11. Summary Structure of Time Budgets
12. Structure of Weekly Free-Time Budget
13. Weekly Budget of Non-Working Time
14. Free Time Spent in Civic Activity

Of these, Table 11 comes closest to integrating all of the statistical data presented. [This table is reproduced on the next page.]

The Leningrad University study consisted of gathering and analyzing 100 weekly time budgets from different kinds of employees (workers, engineers and technicians, and office personnel) of the great Kirov (formerly Putilov) factory in Leningrad. All of the sample came from the factory's tool and die shop. The report notes that this shop holds the title of Communist Work Group, a token of the seeking and achieve-

Table 11, Leningrad University Study (1961)

Summary Structure of Time Budgets
(total weekly time budget equals 100%)

Groups of Personnel		Time expenditures				
		Working time	Non-working, connected with job	Housework and personal care	Physiological requirements	Free time
Sex	Men	26.3	6.3	5.5	36.5	25.4
	Women	24.0	6.1	13.1	34.9	21.9
Age	18 to 30	24.4	6.9	6.6	35.4	26.7
	31 to 40	26.1	5.6	8.3	36.2	23.8
	Over 40	27.5	5.6	9.0	36.9	21.0
Education	Elementary	25.5	7.0	5.2	37.7	26.4
	Seven-year school	25.6	6.7	7.3	36.8	23.6
	Secondary and special secondary	25.4	6.1	8.2	35.5	24.3
	Higher and incom- plete higher	27.1	6.2	8.3	34.1	24.3
Category of Personnel	Workers	24.6	7.0	6.2	35.8	26.4
	Engineering-technical personnel and office employees	27.3	5.0	10.1	36.5	21.1

ment of high output. No other recent publication by Soviet sociologists presents as systematic or extensive a statement of research methods:

How was the composition of the sample determined?

One might have proceeded from the principle of proportional representation of various categories of personnel in accordance with the composition of the shop, plant, or branch of industry under study. This approach (a stratification stereotype) would be correct if time budgets were being studied per se. But inasmuch as the task before us was that of determining primarily the possibilities inherent in time budget analysis as a method, we sought to achieve maximum representation of various groups of working people in a sample of minimum size.

As a consequence, the sample of 100 persons was made up as follows:

Social status: 62 workers, 38 engineering-technical personnel and office employees.

Sex: 71 men, 29 women.

Age: Under 30—46 persons; 31 to 40—22 persons; 40 and over—32 persons.

Family status: with family—36 persons; no family—64 persons.

Education: 6 persons with less than 7-year schooling; 41 with incomplete secondary education; 45 with complete general or specialized secondary education; 8 persons with higher or incomplete higher education.

Present participation in education: 34 not studying, 30 attending Schools for Working Youth, evening colleges and technical schools or preparatory courses for college entry, 36 attending Party and Komsomol educational activities, universities of culture, and so forth.

Party status: CP members—40; Komsomol members—24; non-members—36.

Relationship to movement for Communist labor (workers only): shock workers and members of communist labor brigades—29; non-holders of these titles—33.

From the principle of selection, the sociologists from Leningrad University go on to outline the actual selection process and data analysis:

In selecting the persons queried the voluntary principle was rigidly adhered to, and the individual was free not to state his name. This provided a certain assurance of the reliability of the data. In order for the general picture to be objective it was also important that we used a week's, and not a day's, time budget.

In the first interview with the subject, the researcher or the volunteer aid explained the goal and object of the study. The subject was then given a notebook with a number in which he independently made a record of his time in the course of the week, with a desired optimal accuracy of 3 to 5 minutes, starting at 6 a.m. the following morning. The accuracy of the record kept was checked daily or every other day, at which time the subject turned over the filled sheets in his notebook.

The first stage in the processing of the material gathered consisted of adding similar types of time expenditures for each person queried and entering the results on an individual card, developed on the basis of the cards prepared by the Scientific Research Institute for Labor and Wages and the Siberian Branch of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences. The second stage involved calculation of time expenditures by groups and entry of the resultant data in a matrix. The final stage was the compilation of tables and graphs, most of which are presented in this article.

How the authors of this study relate their findings to work attitudes is shown in their statement that "the manner in which time is spent is, in general, one of the objective indicators of the interests of the working people, and study of this indicator is one of the means of understanding the spiritual world of the individual." (58)

Another indication of the link between time-budget studies and the theme of work attitudes is a subsequent, as yet unpublished study by the same Leningrad University group. The new study deals with work attitudes among young workers. Yadov, head of the Social Research Laboratory, has provided a preliminary report on this study.

The general research topic of the Leningrad University group of sociologists is "transforming work into the prime life requirement." This is viewed as the basis of moulding a communist attitude to work. The

(58) E. V. Beliaev, V. V. Vodzinskaia, A. G. Zdravomyslov, B. V. Ornatskii, A. S. Shaev, and V. A. Yadov, "Workers' Time-Budget Research: A Method of Concrete Sociological Investigation," *Soviet Sociology*, vol. I, no. 1, Summer 1962, pp. 54, 44-45 (translated from *Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta*, Seriiia Ekonomiki, Filosofii i Prava, 1962, no. 4); Table 11 is reproduced on p. 54.

A similarly extensive study, only relatively less comprehensive, is reported by the Social Research Laboratory of Kiev University, attached to the university's Department of Dialectical and Historical Materialism: M. P. Goncharenko and others, "Metodika i Nekotorye Rezultaty Konkretnogo Sotsiologicheskogo Issledovaniia Biudzheta Vremeni Trudiashchikhsia" (Research Methods and Certain Results of Social Research on the Time Budget of Working People), *Filosofskie Nauki*, vol. 6, no. 1 (1963).

Yadov Papers (59) notes at the outset that in the Soviet Union a variety of scholarly publications are available on the subject. But these are described as focusing on the exemplary Brigades of Communist Labor and on individual cases of shock workers. "This stage of research is of course a necessary and important one but apparently only the first stage." (60)

A "considerably deeper" insight into the subject—not only for scholarship but for current policy as well—is promised through empirical research that is extensive, theoretically broad, and methodologically rigorous. To carry out these objectives, the Leningrad University group decided to concentrate its study on younger workers, up to the age of 30.

The reasons for selecting this age group are revealing: "... this is the category within the working class which in its general educational and technical preparation reflects most closely the contemporary trends of development of the whole working class;" the development of "a communist attitude to work" in the population depends to a considerable extent on how successfully this development occurs in the younger generation; finally, this younger generation constitutes as much as 30-40% of workers in Leningrad enterprises. Between 2,500 and 3,000 younger workers were studied in twenty Leningrad factories, representing different industries and working conditions. Several types of questionnaires and interviews were used, and the data was analyzed with the aid of computer equipment. There was a control group of 5% of the sample.

According to Yadov, key analytical areas were the impact of technological change on individual workers, and the related questions of different work motivations. The motivations and attitudes mentioned specifically in the Yadov Paper are: involvement in the work process and

(59) V. A. Yadov, "Formirovanie Kommunisticheskogo Otnosheniia k Trudu u Rabochei Molodezhi, Opyt Organizatsii Konkretno-Sotsiologicheskogo Issledovaniia" (The Formation of a Communist Attitude to Work Among Young Workers, A Study in Concrete Sociological Research)", **Nauchnaia Konferentsiia Kafedr Obshchestvennykh Nauk Vuzov Severa-Zapada, Ianvar 1963 g., Tezisy i Doklady po Sektsii Filosofii** (Scientific Conference of Social Science Departments of Institutions of Higher Education in the North-West Region, January 1963, Abstracts and Papers of the Philosophy Section). The volume was published by the R.S.F.S.R. (Russian Federation) Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education, North-Western Regional Council for the Coordination of Research in the Humanities (Leningrad: Ministervstvo Vysshego i Srednego Spetsialnogo Obrazovaniia RSFSR, Severo-Zapadnyi Sovet Po Koordinatsii Nauchno-Issledovatelnykh Rabot Po Gumanitarnym Naukam, 1963). Yadov's essay appears on pp. 48-53. The essay is hereafter cited as **Yadov Paper**.

(60) Yadov Paper, p. 48.

satisfaction gained from it, good wages, a friendly group of workmates, a convenient system of shifts, benefiting society, interest in a particular kind of work or product, comradely attitudes of fellow workers, attentiveness by management, the opportunity to increase skills in a given job, and good organization of the work process. The multiplicity and complexity of work attitudes is emphasized, as against the "extreme simplification"—found "frequently"—which divides them into only two categories, moral and material. (61)

A recurrent theme, based on some specific examples, is that grounding policy recommendations in scholarly research is not enough. Recommendations must also take into account a "differentiated approach to various categories of workers. The inculcation of a communist attitude to work must be a differentiated one." The concluding paragraph of the Yadov Paper returns to the question of policy recommendations: "We hope that the research we are conducting will make possible the formulation of concrete recommendations, directed at the improvement of our [Soviet] activities in the realm of inculcating a communist attitude to work among young workers." (62)

Most Soviet sociological writings on work attitudes are not as comprehensive as this, either theoretically or methodologically. As the Yadov Paper mentioned, much of the research to date focuses on selected and leading workers and groups. A recurrent area of research is the differing work performance between such leading workers and other workers. Often such research investigates either Socialist Competition within or between factories, or the number of suggestions for technological improvements (the "rationalization movement").

The Sverdlovsk study illustrates this kind of research. For instance, one statistical table shows the number of workers who passed on advanced skills to other workers in the course of Socialist Competition. According to this table, based on 1958 studies in three major factories of the Sverdlovsk area—the number interviewed was 142, 194, and 43, respectively—the percentage of workers who did pass on advanced skills to fellow workers was 31%, 11% and 77%. Another statistical table in the Sverdlovsk study (also based on 1958 interviews) reports that in one major

(61) Yadov Paper, p. 50.

(62) Yadov Paper, pp. 51, 53. Two senior authors of this study touch on the subject in a general methodological essay: A. G. Zdravomyslov and V. A. Yadov, "O Programirovanii Konkretnogo Sotsialnogo Issledovaniia" (On the Programming of Concrete Social Investigations), *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVII, no. 8 (1963).

factory 35 out of 142 workers studied made "rationalization" suggestions, while at another 54 out of 194 did. A further statistical table in the Sverdlovsk study, based on 1960 interviews, contrasts such suggestions by workers who were involved in competition and those who were not. Figures are given for two groups of workers—100 workers who were competing and 100 not competing. 29% of the first group contributed suggestions as against 11% of the second. (63)

Although Soviet writings often speak of the fundamental differences between work attitudes under Socialism and Capitalism, there has been almost no attempt actually to compare empirical data. However, two such studies were published in 1963 by Soviet sociologists. Both sought to match Soviet data with separate earlier sample surveys, conducted in France. The less extensive of the two Soviet studies is reported by L. N. Kogan of Ural University. It compares the findings in France by J. Dofny and others, *Attitudes des Ouvriers de la Siderurgie a l'egard des Changements Techniques* (Paris, 1957), obtained at an unspecified steel plant, with 1962 findings in two Soviet enterprises, the Ural Machine Factory in Sverdlovsk and the Kuibishev Machine Building Factory in Irkutsk, Siberia. (6) Kogan's paper reports on the answers obtained to one particular question:

Question: "What effect will technological progress have on the situation of workers fifty years from now?"

	FRENCH FACTORY (N:156)	SVERDLOVSK FACTORY (N:197)	IRKUTSK FACTORY (N:170)
Optimistic answers	52 (33.3%)	176 (89.3%)	157 (92.3%)
Pessimistic answers	54 (34.6%)	2 (1%)	5 (2.9%)
No change expected	28 (18%)	12 (6.1%)	—
No answer	22 (14.1%)	7 (3.6%)	8 (4.8%)

The second comparative study was made by a sociologist in the

(63) **Podem Kulturno-Tekhnicheskogo Urovnia Sovetskogo Rabochego Klassa** (The Rise of the Cultural and Technical Level of the Soviet Working Class), edited by M. T. Yovchuk and others (Moscow: Publishing House of Social and Economic Literature, 1961), pp. 228, 298, 314.

(64) L. N. Kogan, "Nauchno-Tekhnicheskii Progress v SSSR i Vsestoronnee Razvitie Lichnosti Rabochego" (Scientific and Technical Progress in the U.S.S.R. and the All-around Development of the Worker's Personality), *Filosofskie Nauki*, vol. 6, no. 4 (1963), p. 29.

Philosophy Institute, N. F. Naumova. Her paper is entitled "Two Worlds—Two Attitudes to Work." (65)

The heart of the Naumova study is the interviewing by her, in 1962, of fifty workers in an unspecified Moscow factory. The interviews aimed to match in every way (size of sample, occupation, age, sex, and skills) a French study of 1958, *L'Ouvrier d'Aujourd'hui*, by A. Andrieux and J. Lignon. Naumova worked with the same open-ended questionnaire that Andrieux and Lignon used. Naumova reports the following questions and replies:

1. Question A—"Do you like your work?"

	YES	NO	INDEFINITE ANSWERS
France (N:58)	17	36	5
U.S.S.R. (N:58)	52	5	1

2. Control I of Question A, first part—"Do you think of your work during your leisure time?"

	YES	NO	ONLY WHEN PROBLEMS ARISE	NO ANSWER
France	6	35	13	4
U.S.S.R.	43	9	6	—

3. Control I of Question A, second part—"If you do think about work during leisure time, what are your feelings?"

	WITH CONCERN AND WORRY*	WITH DIFFERENT FEELINGS	WITH FAVORABLE FEELINGS
France	13	6	**
U.S.S.R.	8	6	35

4. Control II of Question A—"What time of the day is the most pleasant for you?"

(65) N. F. Naumova, "Dva Mira—Dva Otnosheniia k Trudu," *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVII, no. 1 (1963).

*As reproduced by Naumova, the French questionnaire also specified "and negative feelings."

**This alternative was not included in the French data.

Morning	12
Evening (because one can rest up)	18
Evening (because I worked well)	6
The working day	17
Indefinite answers	5

5. Question B—"What do you dislike the most in your factory?"

There are sixteen different categories of answers to this query in the French questionnaire, and ten in the Soviet one. Of these twenty-six categories, only one is wholly identical: "noise." Three other categories of replies overlap. These are the French "Bad organization" and the Soviet "Organization of work;" the French "Conditions of work and dirt" and the Soviet "Dirt"; and probably also the French "Subordination and dependence" and the Soviet "Discipline". However, most replies are classified so differently that the two questionnaires cannot be viewed comparatively.

FRANCE

Noise	1
Poor safety measures	1
Not working in own specialty	1
Low culture of workers	1
Feeling of loneliness	2
Hygiene and coatrooms	2
Work hours too long	2
Bad organization	2
Tempo of work	3
The fact that you are not considered a human being	3
The work	7
Dislike everything	7
Poor relations among workers	8
Monotony of work	13
Conditions of work and dirt	13
Subordination and dependence	42

***Naumova states that the French study does not furnish data on the replies to this question. She adds that one can surmise that the worst part of the day was the morning, when one had to get up and go to work, and the best the evening, when work is over.

U.S.S.R.

Noise	3
Dirt	4
Crowding	9
Cafeteria	3
Organization of work	8
Discipline	4
Hygiene and coatroom	9
Night shift	3
Indefinite answers	6
Like everything	9

6. Question C—"Is your work interesting?"

U.S.S.R.****

Yes	44
No	14

On this last question, Naumova adds an illuminating comment. Comparing the Soviet replies to Question A, about how much they liked their work, and Question C, as to whether they found it interesting, she notes that while there are 52 Soviet respondents who like their work, only 44 find it interesting. Naumova goes on to say:

If this question is explored more deeply, it turns out that the difference is even greater since, in our opinion, the work of only 20 workers out of the 58 is in itself technically interesting. The remaining 38 workers are doing "operational," routine work. Nevertheless, 33 of them were able to come to like the work, to find in it something interesting and attractive. The explanation for this lies in a sense of duty, and a consciousness of the need by our society for the work of every worker. A twenty-two-year-old woman, a coil winder, wrote in her questionnaire: "I would not say that my work is interesting but I am satisfied with it. For through our work we are contributing to the building of communism."

This comment links up with a concluding point of the paper:

It would be wrong to count on us being able to provide absorbing and creative work in the immediate future for all members of our society. For this reason it is essential to

****The Naumova paper does not mention whether the French study published any replies or not.

inculcate in every person a feeling of duty which makes him put all of his strength and abilities into the work he is doing, as well as an honest attitude toward his work regardless of what it is. (66)

Naumova's attempt to compare work attitudes in major industrial societies contains no data on research methods, and Kogan's one-question comparison offers only some. Instead, much space is devoted to highly generalized doctrinal comparisons between Socialism and Capitalism. Until collaborative studies are undertaken, or at least until separate studies of a comparative nature offer more information on precisely how they were conducted, the Naumova and Kogan types of comparison are probably the best we can expect. Meanwhile, larger and more systematic studies of Soviet work attitudes, like those made by Leningrad University sociologists, may provide some important insights into this key form of socialization in all modern and modernizing societies.

(66) N. F. Naumova, "Dva Mira—Dva Otnosheniia k Trudu" (Two Worlds—Two Attitudes to Work), *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVII, no. 1 (1963), p. 23. Naumova's survey data appears on pp. 19-23.

A report in *Voprosy Filosofii*, on a Leningrad meeting to discuss the work of the journal, states that a number of social scientists—especially I. S. Kon and V. A. Yadov—criticized the Naumova paper. Among the criticisms was Naumova's small sample of 58. The report was published in *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVII, no. 9 (1963), pp. 159-160.

CHAPTER VII

Theory: Class Structure

Sociology in the U.S.S.R. assigns first place to class structure. Thus, when Osipov and Yovchuk outlined the program of the field to the Fifth World Congress of Sociology, they began with this topic:

Problems under study include the eradication of class distinctions between the working class, peasants, and intellectuals and the difficulties involved in bringing physical and mental workers closer together. (67)

The nature and development of class structure within Soviet society occupies a central position in each and every official pronouncement on the present and future of Soviet society. Yet the empirical research of the new sociology has approached class structure only indirectly so far. It does so through work in the research areas already singled out in the present essay: the impact of technological change, the general education and professional training of industrial workers, and attitudes to work.

But if Soviet sociologists do not explore class structure primarily through empirical research, a major portion of their writings and programmatic statements do focus on the subject. To the extent that the new sociology has a theoretical domain of its own, within the larger framework of official doctrine, this domain is class structure. And since Soviet sociology today is in large measure a sociology of work, such a theoretical focus is quite congruent with its empirical research.

At the same time, a theoretical orientation toward class structure links the new sociology to the state's central ideological concerns. On the one hand, this enhances the standing of the field and bears out the affirmations, both scholarly and official, that Soviet sociology must maintain precisely this kind of intimate link with official doctrine. On the other hand, it explains in large measure why, as the Merton Report noted, "ideological overtones are most audible when it comes to sociological theory" (68), and why the substance and language of such theory

(67) Osipov Paper, p. 623.

(68) Merton Report, p. 6.

resemble official doctrine so completely. No other branch of Soviet scholarship, no other field in the social sciences, is as close to ideology and all that this implies.

The link between scholarly theory and official doctrine is both cause and effect of a further feature of Soviet sociology. The first part of the present essay has already touched on the new sociologists' statements of resolute opposition to Western-type "theories of the middle range." Again and again, Soviet sociologists assert not only the feasibility but the absolute desirability of joining empirical research directly to theory of an all-encompassing kind. In practice, further growth of the field may conceivably lead to some theoretical differentiation and specialization. Meanwhile, however, the theory of Soviet sociology is the same as the state's current doctrine of society. This is how Soviet sociologists present their theory, and this is how social scientists elsewhere should view it.

Within this context, a number of leading Soviet sociologists have of late published theoretical essays on class structure which help to clarify what these sociologists seem to mean by theory. Three such essays appear in a major recent volume of which the chief editor is Academician P. N. Fedoseev, the philosopher-ideologist and Academy vice-president who has been an influential supporter of the new sociology. All of the volume, including the essays on sociological theory, deals with the transition from the present to the future Soviet society, or, as the volume is entitled, *From Socialism to Communism*. (69) The titles of the essays, as well as their authors, typify the present state of the field:

1. V. S. Semenov (Philosophy Institute), "Changes in the Working Class and the Intelligentsia during the Transition to Communism."

2. A. N. Maslin (Philosophy Institute) and G. V. Osipov (Philosophy Institute), "The Merger of Mental and Physical Labor—One of the Most Important Tasks of Building Communism."

3. M. T. Yovchuk (until recently Ural University, now chief editor of *Filosofskie Nauki* in Moscow), L. N. Kogan (Ural University), and M. N. Rutkevich (Ural University), "Rise of the Cultural and Technical Level of the Working Class and its Role in Merging Physical and Mental Labor in the U.S.S.R."

(69) *Ot Sotsializma k Kommunizmu*, edited by P. M. Fedoseev and others (Moscow: Publishing House of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, 1962), 750 pp. The volume is cited hereafter as **From Socialism to Communism**.

In contrast to the prevailing preoccupation of sociologists abroad with stratification or mobility within the present social structure, the Soviet sociologists are concerned with identifying and facilitating trends toward a wholly different class structure—or, in fact, toward a society without class structure. Such an “activist” approach to class structure is part of a broader Soviet practice of emphasizing the actual or desired harbingers of the future, as against the sum total of contemporary phenomena. This is strikingly borne out by these essays, all of which deal with the same aspect of Soviet class structure. It is the eventual elimination of significant class distinctions in forms of work and living. What each essay treats is not so much present class structure, but the portion of it that should or does point to the desired future. As a result, neither social mobility nor stratification are ever explored as such.

It is characteristic, moreover, that all the essays concentrate on the blue collar-white collar juxtaposition in the urban setting, as against the urban-rural juxtaposition. This urban-rural juxtaposition is the other element of the class structure, according to Soviet doctrine, that calls for the greatest change between present and future Soviet society. Like official ideology, the theory of Soviet sociology in principle assigns equal importance to these two basic transformations of the class structure. But industrialization and everything directly associated with it remain closest to the state’s practical and theoretical concerns. Hence theory as well as research in Soviet sociology has dwelt mainly on urban elements of the class structure.

The first of the essays, by V. S. Semenov, takes up the changing composition of the working class, and then of the “intelligentsia.” He makes extensive use of published Soviet statistical data, notably from recent and earlier censuses of the population. He also makes differentiations within these groups, to a greater extent than is usually done in Soviet writings.

On industrial labor, Semenov’s opening proposition is that

The general tendency of the development of the working class during the building of socialism and its completion is: its steady growth in number as well as in relative weight in the gainfully employed portion of the population, and in the whole social structure of the society.

Since 1917, according to Semenov’s figures, the percentage of workers and their families in the population at large has increased 3.5 times, from

14.8% in 1913 to over 50% in 1961. In the 1959 census, the total was approximately 45 million out of 99 million employed. (70)

The parallel growth in general education and vocational training is illustrated by the fact that highly skilled and skilled workers increased from 18.5% of the working class in 1925 to 50% in 1950. Within the working class, the balance also shifted from light industry to steel industry and machine building. In 1913 there were twice as many workers in light industry as in steel and machine building, while in 1961 the situation was almost exactly reversed. Meanwhile, the proportion of women workers in certain categories has increased up to a quarter or even half of the total. (71)

Semenov develops as follows the central Soviet thesis on the subject:

The heterogeneity of the composition of the Soviet working class, in terms of nature of work and level of development, objectively determines the complicated, stage-by-stage process of its transformation in the course of building communism.

On the one hand, the lowest and middle groups of workers, from the point of view of the character of their work, will be pulled up to the level of workers engaged in automated, semi-automated, and complex mechanized work. On the other hand, the development of workers in automated and mechanized areas of production, and those workers who will continuously shift over to these areas, will lead ever more to their merger with personnel in engineering and technical [mental] work.

What will take place thereby, simultaneously with the development of the working class, is the process of gradual eradication of the lines between it and the intelligentsia, a process of ever greater merger of the working class with the engineering and technical intelligentsia into a classless collective of laboring people. (72)

When Semenov turns from the working class to the intelligentsia, he enters upon one of the least developed areas of Soviet theory and research. To this neglected area, his essay contributes both statistical data and some definitions and descriptions.

According to Semenov, what he calls "the new, genuinely grass-roots intelligentsia" emerged with the Soviet industrialization of the

(70) *From Socialism to Communism*, p. 248.

(71) *From Socialism to Communism*, p. 250.

(72) *From Socialism to Communism*, p. 252.

1930's; in the single decade from 1926 to 1937 it increased three and a half times. In 1959 the intelligentsia in the broadest sense made up 16-20% of the population and numbered over 20 million. Of this new "intelligentsia of the people" 80-90% consists of persons of working-class and peasant origins. This group received 4.4 times as much education in 1938-1958 as in 1918-1937. During the earlier of these periods 880,000 "specialists" completed their higher education and 1,112,000 their secondary education, while in the second period the number rose to 3,200,000 and 5,624,000 respectively. This change in the level of education manifests itself as follows, in terms of the number of the total of college and high school graduates per 1000 persons:

Personnel in cultural work and education:	1939-594; 1959-958
Agricultural specialists:	1939-630; 1959-936
Engineers and technicians:	1939-630; 1959-910

Simultaneously, a major shift took place in the relative weight of different components. The proportion of employees declined in economic and government administration, and in cooperative and civic organizations. On the other hand, the proportion of those involved in "creating material and spiritual goods," the development of science, and medical services grew steadily. (73)

Semenov goes on to discuss the actual make-up of the protean amalgam to which official Soviet usage assigns the collective term of "intelligentsia."

The stratum of intelligentsia and employees is heterogeneous in composition. The notions themselves of "intelligentsia" and "employees" have different meanings. Neither of them are precise social categories, for they characterize working persons from different vantage points. The notion of "intelligentsia" describes people from the point of view of their work, namely mental, intellectual labor. The notion of "employees" presumes a category of working persons who are in the service of the state and civic organizations, and who receive an established salary and have definite functions and obligations. Under socialism the overwhelming majority of the intelligentsia are employees. However, not all employees belong

(73) **From Socialism to Communism**, pp. 256-258. Elsewhere, Rutkevich offers another analysis of the intelligentsia: "Stiranie Klassovykh Granei i Mesto Intelligentsii v Sotsialnoi Strukture Sovetskogo Obshchestva" (The Eradication of Class Lines and the Place of the Intelligentsia in the Social Structure of Soviet Society), *Filosofskie Nauki*, vol. 6, no. 5 (1963).

to the category of personnel in mental, intellectual work; a considerable portion of employees actually is not in this category.

From Marx, the author derives a three-fold distinction between types of mental work. The first type contributes directly to material wealth (engineers, for instance); the second type through mental work creates goods which can be sold (painters); the third type produces something which is inseparable from the act of producing it (doctors, teachers). Semenov extrapolates from this to Soviet society of our time:

From the point of view of the given conception of mental work, the first type under socialism covers the technical and economic intelligentsia; the second type characterizes part of the scientific and cultural intelligentsia (scholars, writers, many artists); the third type covers the state, party, and ideological apparatus; many state employees; parts of the scientific and cultural intelligentsia (teachers, doctors [performing] artists); the military intelligentsia; part of the militia [police] personnel.

But one cannot include in any of these types of mental work, in the full sense of the word, clerical employees, employees in communication, trade, and eating places (salesmen, clerks, waiters); public utilities and local services (for instance, night watchmen and guards); some state employees (insurance agencies, credit institutions); a certain portion of the military and militia personnel.

Not all of these people are engaged in intellectual work, or spiritual activity in its genuine meaning. In their work elements of physical and mental work are combined. This type of activity has a specific character, and can be called service work.

... if we conceive of the "intelligentsia" as the sum of personnel in mental work, and "employees" as the sum of personnel in service work, the notions of "intelligentsia" and "employees" acquire a fairly clearcut social meaning. (7)

One of the most substantial sections of this essay is an occupation-by-occupation discussion of current and foreseeable changes—changes in the nature of work and in the labor force involved. Throughout, the discussion is on the level of technological and educational factors. At no time does the discussion touch on any areas, actual or conceivable, of functional or individual strains or conflict. From this discussion, Semenov arrives at the following conclusion:

(74) *From Socialism to Communism*, pp. 259-260.

Analyzing tendencies of change among the intelligentsia and employee groups during the building of communism shows that the main groups of the intelligentsia will to a very large degree grow in size; most of the groups of employees will steadily grow smaller, although some of them (employees of trade and public eating-places) will likewise increase in size. On the whole the intelligentsia and employee stratum will significantly grow in its relative weight in the social structure, due most of all to the large growth of the technical and economic intelligentsia and the scientific and cultural intelligentsia. One can assume that by 1980 the relative weight of the intelligentsia and employees in the population of the U.S.S.R. will rise to approximately 25-35% [as against 16-20% in 1959]. (75)

After enumerating the various areas of economic, cultural and private life to which the intelligentsia will contribute increasingly, Semenov states that at the same time these activities will increasingly lose their character of "exclusiveness." The main reason for this will be the ever-increasing skills and interests of workers and peasants, who will share the concerns of the intelligentsia much more fully. In closing, the essay reiterates the Soviet doctrine that, as Semenov puts it, "the organic merger into one laboring collective of workers, peasants, the intelligentsia, and employees will mean the end of dividing society into classes and social strata."

The second essay on class structure, by Maslin and Osipov, consists of a synthesis of current Soviet views on the inevitable merger of physical and mental work in the course of building communism, and on how this end is to be achieved. The essay therefore emphasizes the impact of technological change and also of education and vocational training. Here and there it touches on the historical background of present trends, or makes comparisons with developments in other industrial societies. The third and last of these essays in social theory is by the senior authors of the Sverdlovsk study. This essay summarizes and develops the 1961 book's material on the role of workers' schooling in transforming the class structure enroute to communism.

So far, none of these authors, nor the other sociologists mentioned, have participated in a major current discussion in *Voprosy Filosofii*. The discussion is fundamental to all of Soviet social theory and the sociology of work. Its subject is "the division of labor and the all-around development of the individual."

(75) *From Socialism to Communism*, p. 270-271.

According to some contributors to *Voprosy Filosofii*, Soviet experience in building communism indicates that a division of labor will continue under communism, although in a novel, post-capitalist form compatible with Marx's ideal of the "all-around development of the individual." Other participants in the discussion reaffirm the long-standing Marxist view that a fully-developed communist society eliminates the division of labor altogether. The strongest statement in favor of this view was made by Academician S. G. Strumilin, whom a number of Soviet sociologists cite as their direct forerunner. Strumilin points to Soviet-type collectivism as the alternative to the individualism which he says inevitably underlies a social division of labor. He also speaks critically of "many participants in the discussion" who take the other position, and "not a few, no doubt, among our intelligentsia." (76)

(76) The discussion appears in *Voprosy Filosofii*, issues no. 3, 4, and 10 for 1962 and issue no. 9 for 1963. Strumilin is quoted from *Voprosy Filosofii*, vol. XVI, no. 3 (1962), p. 38.

The initial statement in the discussion postulated "the objective necessity of a social division of labor under communism." This statement came from A. K. Kurylev, who is associated with Moscow University's Institute for Advanced Faculty Training in the Social Sciences. Kurylev develops his views further in his book, *Preodolenie Sushchestvennykh Razlichii mezhdu Umstvennym i Fizicheskim Trudom—Problema Stroitelstva Kommunizma* (Overcoming Significant Differences between Mental and Physical Labor, A Problem in the Building of Communism), (Moscow University Press, 1963).

In another book, a Leningrad economist appears to oppose Kurylev on this issue when he expresses disagreement with "some sociologists" and espouses the traditional view that Academician Strumilin favored in the *Voprosy Filosofii* discussion: V. P. Kornienko, *Obshchestvennoe Razdelenie Truda v Period Perekhoda k Kommunizmu* (The Social Division of Labor in the Period of Transition to Communism), (Moscow: Publishing House of Economic Literature, 1963). The author refers to "some sociologists" on p. 261 of this book.

In all of its theory and research, the new sociology in the U.S.S.R. represents a singular fusion of science with politics. On the level of theory this means the fusion of academic analysis of society with an official doctrine of society. On the level of research the fusion is between scholarship and all-out service to an omniscient state. Within this pattern, some Soviet sociologists are starting to ask important specialized questions and to validate their answers empirically.

Scientifically, such first steps and new beginnings are significant no matter what the future may bring. In terms of doctrine and policy, the very closeness in this case of science and politics bestows upon Soviet sociologists a novel role in an intricately changing society. At least in the sense of a barometer or weather vane, it could turn out to be true in the U.S.S.R. that "as sociology goes, so goes the nation."

INDEX

- Academy of Social Sciences, CPSU Central Committee, 18, 23-24
 Ahlberg, René, 13n
American Sociological Review, 10
 Andreeva, G. M., 11-12, 23, 28, 31, 39, 42-44
 Arab-Ogly, E. A., 31
 Aseev, Yu. A., 18
- Bakhitov, M. Sh., 13n
 Bashilov, V. I., 37n
 Becker, Howard, 26n
 Beliaev, E. V., 47-50
 Boskoff, Alvin, 26n
 Broom, Leonard, 26n
- Central Statistical Administration of U.S.S.R., 7
 Chagin, B. A., 30n
 Chesnokov, D. I., 16n, 26n
 Chikin, V. V., 7-8
 Commons, John R., 35
- Davies, R. W., 36n
 Durkheim, Emile, 26n
- Economics Institute-Siberian Branch, U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, 22, 25, 31, 45
- Fedoseev, P. N., 18, 59
Filosofskie Nauki [Philosophical Sciences], 10-11, 27, 59
 Frantsev, Yu. P., 18, 24
- Goncharenko, M. P., 50n
 Gorky University, 21
 Grushin, B. A., 7-8
- Igitkhanian, M. Kh., 8
 Ilichev, L. F., 3, 5, 14, 18
- Kharchev, A. G., 26n
 Khrushchev, N. S., 9
 Klykova, O. M., 28n
 Kogan, L. N., 16, 25, 31, 53, 57, 59, 64
 Kolbanovsky, V. N., 31
 Kon, I. S., 18, 57n
 Konstantinov, F. V., 18, 30n
 Kornienko, V. P., 65n
 Kurylev, A. K., 65n
 Kuzmin, E. S., 24
- Laboratory of Industrial Sociology, Leningrad University, 24
 Laboratory of Social Psychology, Leningrad University, 24
 Lazarsfeld, Paul F., 26
- Lenin, V. I., 14
 Leningrad University, 24, 31
 Management Research Laboratory, Moscow University, 23
 Mannheim, Karl, 26n
 Marx, Karl, 14, 39, 45, 63, 65
 Maslin, A. N., 59, 64
 Maslov, P. P., 10n
 Melekhova, A. K., 33n
 Merton, Robert K., 1, 6, 11, 12, 26
 Mills, C. Wright, 26n
 Moldavian Academy of Sciences, 21
 Moscow University, 21, 23, 27, 31, 39, 65n
 Mshvenieradze, V. V., 18, 22
- Naumova, N. F., 54-57
- Olshansky, V., 27
 Ornatetskii, B. V., 47-50
 Osipov, G. V., 2, 5-6, 16n, 22-23, 26n, 28, 31, 58, 59, 64
- Pareto, Vilfredo, 26n
 Parsons, Talcott, 26
 Perfilov, M. N., 28n
 Perlman, Selig, 35
 Philosophy Faculty, Leningrad University, 24
 Philosophy Faculty, Moscow University, 23
 Philosophy Institute, U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, 7, 18, 20-23, 24, 27, 31
 Prudensky, G. A., 25, 31, 45-46
 Psychology Division, Philosophy Institute (U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences), 37
 Public Opinion Institute, **Komsomolskaia Pravda**, 7-8
- Riecken, Henry W., 1
 Rozhin, V. P., 16n, 24
 Rutkevich, M. N., 16, 25, 31, 59, 62n, 64
- Saratov University, 23, 39
 Semenov, V. S., 20-21, 28-30, 31, 59, 60-64
 Selznick, Philip, 26n
 Semenov, Yu. N., 31
 Shaev, A. S., 47-50
 Shils, Edward, 26n
 Simmel, Georg, 26n
 Skilling, Gordon, 19n
 Social Research Division, Economics Institute-Siberian Branch (U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences), 25

- Social Research Division, Philosophy
 Institute (U. S. S. R. Academy of
 Sciences), 20-23, 37
 Social Research Institute, Leningrad,
 24-25
 Social Research Institute, Moscow, 25n
 Social Research Laboratory, Kiev Uni-
 versity, 50n
 Social Research Laboratory, Leningrad
 University, 24, 47-52, 57
 Social Research Laboratory, Moscow
 University, 23
 Social Research Laboratory, Ural Uni-
 versity, 16, 25
 Soviet Sociological Association, 18, 24
 Strumilin, S. G., 36, 65
 Ural University, 25, 31
 U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, general
 meeting on the social sciences, 2-3,
 4, 14
 U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, Lenin-
 grad Branch, 26n
 Valentinova, N. G., 37n
 Veblen, Thorsten, 35
 Vodzinskaia, V. V., 47-50
Voprosy Filosofii [Questions of Philos-
 ophy], 10-11, 16n, 23, 27, 33, 57n,
 64-65
 Weber, Max, 26n
 World Congress of Sociology, Fifth, 2,
 22, 28-31
 World Congress of Sociology, Fourth,
 30n
 Yadov, V. A., 6-7, 12-13, 24, 26, 28,
 47-52, 57n
 Yovchuk, M. T., 2, 5-6, 16, 58, 59, 64
 Zamoshkin, Yu. A., 23, 28, 31
 Zdravomyslov, A. G., 6-7, 12-13, 26,
 47-50, 52n
 Zetterberg, H. L., 12
 Zvorykin, A. A., 21, 31, 37-38, 40,
 43-44

CORNELL RESEARCH PAPERS IN INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

1. *Science and Politics, The New Sociology in the Soviet Union*, by
George Fischer

Price: \$2.00